arXiv:math-ph/0507043v1 18 Jul 2005

THE RENORMALIZED ELECTRON MASS IN NON-RELATIVISTIC QUANTUM ELECTRODYNAMICS

VOLKER BACH, THOMAS CHEN, JÜRG FRÖHLICH, AND ISRAEL MICHAEL SIGAL

Abstract. This work addresses the problem of infrared mass renormalization for a scalar electron in a translation-invariant model of non-relativistic QED. We assume that the interaction of the electron with the quantized electromagnetic field comprises a fixed ultraviolet regularization and an infrared regularization parametrized by $\sigma > 0$. For the value $p = 0$ of the conserved total momentum of electron and photon field, bounds on the renormalized mass are established which are uniform in $\sigma \to 0$, and the existence of a ground state is proved. For $|p| > 0$ sufficiently small, bounds on the renormalized mass are derived for any fixed $\sigma > 0$. A key ingredient of our proofs is the operator-theoretic renormalization group using the isospectral smooth Feshbach map. It provides an explicit, finite algorithm that determines the renormalized electron mass at $p = 0$ to any given precision.

Contents

1. Definition of the model 3
2. Statement of the main results 5
2.1. Discussion 7
3. Strategy and organization of the proof 8
3.1. Smooth Feshbach map 9
3.2. A Banach space of generalized Wick kernels 9
3.3. The isospectral renormalization map $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ 12
3.4. Codimension two contraction property of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ on a polydisc 13
3.5. The first Feshbach decimation step 14
3.6. The isospectral renormalization group flow 14
3.7. Ground state eigenvalue and eigenvector 14
3.8. Soft photon sum rules 15
3.9. Determination of the renormalized mass 16
3.10. New techniques 17
3.11. Relations to Nelson's model 17
4. The smooth Feshbach map 19
4.1. Feshbach pairs and smooth Feshbach map 19
4.2. Feshbach isospectrality 20
4.3. Derivations 21
4.4. Compositions 21
4.5. Organizing overlap terms 22
5. Isospectral renormalizaton group: Effective Hamiltonians 23
5.1. A Banach space of generalized Wick kernels 25
6. Isospectral renormalizaton group: Renormalization map 27
6.1. Definition of the isospectral renormalizaton map 28

6.2. Choice of a free comparison theory 29
6.3. The domain of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ 31
6.4. Generalized Wick ordering 32
6.5. Soft photon sum rules 34
6.6. Codimension two contractivity of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ on a polydisc 36
7. Proof of Theorem 6.6: Generalized Wick ordering 36
7.1. Proof of Lemma 7.1 38
8. Proof of Theorem 6.6: Soft photon sum rules 45
9. Proof of Theorem 6.6: Codimension two contractivity for $p \neq 0$ 48
10. Proof of Theorem 6.6: Codimension two contractivity for $p = 0$ 51
11. The first Feshbach decimation step 54
11.1. The result 54
11.2. Proof of Theorem 11.1: Domain of $F_{\chi_1[H_f]}$ 57
11.3. Proof of Theorem 11.1: Generalized Wick ordering 59
11.4. Proof of Theorem 11.1: Mapping into a polydisc 62
11.5. Proof of Theorem 11.1: Soft photon sum rules 62
12. Reconstruction of the ground state eigenvalue and eigenvector 62
13. The renormalized mass at non-vanishing conserved momentum 68
13.1. The main theorem 69
13.2. Proof of Lemma 13.2 76
14. Uniform bounds for vanishing conserved momentum 80
14.1. A second definition of the renormalized mass 81
14.2. The main theorem 81
15. Identification of two definitions of the renormalized mass 84
16. Computation of the renormalized mass 94
16.1. Determination of the renormalized mass in leading order 94
Acknowledgements 100
References 100

Conventions: We use units in which the velocity of light c, Planck's constant $\hbar$, and the bare electron mass m have the values $c = \hbar = m = 1$.
The letters C or c denote various constants whose values may change from one estimate to another.
$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)$ denote the linear, and the bounded linear operators $\mathcal{H}_1 \to \mathcal{H}_2$ for Banach spaces $\mathcal{H}_1$, $\mathcal{H}_2$.
$D_r(z) \subset \mathbb{C}$ is the closed disc of radius r centered at z, and $D_r \equiv D_r(0)$.
$B_r(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is the closed ball of radius r centered at $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and $B_r \equiv B_r(0)$.
$\langle v, v' \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}$ denotes the Euclidean scalar product for vectors $v, v' \in \mathbb{R}^3$.
$v^2 \equiv \langle v, v \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} \equiv |v|^2$.

1. Definition of the model

We study the translation-invariant system of a non-relativistic, spin-0 electron in $\mathbb{R}^3$ that is minimally coupled to the ultraviolet regularized quantized electromagnetic field. This model of quantum electrodynamics (QED) with non-relativistic matter has originally been proposed by Dirac and Jordan.

The Hilbert space of the (spinless) electron is given by

$$\mathcal{H}_{el} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, d^3x_{el}) \; . \tag{1.1}$$

The field quanta of the quantized electromagnetic field are massless, relativistic bosons, referred to as *photons*. The Hilbert space of one-photon states is given by

$$\mathfrak{h} := L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, d^3k) \otimes \mathbb{C}^2 \; , \tag{1.2}$$

where $k \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the momentum of a photon. The factor $\mathbb{C}^2$ accommodates its transverse polarization states in the Coulomb gauge. One can choose a pair of polarization vectors $\epsilon(k,\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $|\epsilon(k,\lambda)| = 1$, for $\lambda \in \{+,-\}$, associated to every $k \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$, such that the triple $(\epsilon(k,+), \epsilon(k,-), n_k := \frac{k}{|k|})$ is an orthonormal basis in $\mathbb{R}^3$. The label $\lambda \in \{+,-\}$ indicates the polarization of the photon.

The bosonic Fock space describing the pure states of the quantized electromagnetic field is defined by

$$\mathcal{F} \;\; = \;\; \bigoplus_{n\geq 0} \mathrm{Sym}_n \mathfrak{h}^{\otimes n} \; , \tag{1.3}$$

where Sym_n is the orthogonal projection onto the subspace of totally symmetric n-particle wave functions in the n-fold tensor product of $\mathfrak{h}$. The zero photon sector is given by $\mathrm{Sym}_0 \mathfrak{h}^{\otimes 0} := \mathbb{C}\{\Omega\}$, where Ω is the vacuum vector in $\mathcal{F}$. Vectors $\Psi \in \mathcal{F}$ are identified with sequences $(\psi_0, \psi_1, \dots)$, where $\psi_0 \in \mathbb{C}$, and where $\psi_n(k_1, \lambda_1, \dots, k_n, \lambda_n)$ are n-particle wave functions that are totally symmetric with respect to their n arguments.

For convenience, we introduce the notation

$$K := (k,\lambda) \;\; , \; \int dK := \sum_{\lambda \in \{+,-\}} \int d^3k \; , \tag{1.4}$$

and

$$\mu K := (\mu k, \lambda) \;\; \text{for } \mu \in \mathbb{R} \; . \tag{1.5}$$

The inner product on $\mathcal{F}$ is then defined by

$$\langle \, \Psi \, , \, \Phi \, \rangle := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int dK_1 \cdots dK_n \, \overline{\psi_n(K_1, \dots, K_n)} \, \phi_n(K_1, \dots, K_n) \; . \tag{1.6}$$

Given $\lambda \in \{+,-\}$ and $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, d^3k)$, we define an *annihilation operator* $a(f,\lambda)$ acting on any $\Psi = (\psi_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ with only finitely many non-zero entries by

$$(a(f,\lambda)\Psi)_n(K_1, \dots, K_n) := \sqrt{n+1} \int d^3k \bar{f}(k) \psi_{n+1}(k, \lambda, K_1, \dots, K_n) \tag{1.7}$$

and

$$a(f,\lambda)\Omega = 0 \; . \tag{1.8}$$

This defines a closable operator $a(f,\lambda)$ on $\mathcal{F}$ whose closure is also denoted by $a(f,\lambda)$. The adjoint of $a(f,\lambda)$ with respect to the scalar product on $\mathcal{F}$ is the *creation operator* $a^*(f,\lambda)$. With $a(f,\lambda)$ being anti-linear, and $a^*(f,\lambda)$ being linear in f, it is possible to write

$$a(f,\lambda) = \int d^3k\, \overline{f(k)}\, a(k,\lambda) \ \ , \ \ a^*(f,\lambda) = \int d^3k\, f(k)\, a^*(k,\lambda) \ , \tag{1.9}$$

where $a(K)$ and $a^*(K)$ are unbounded, operator-valued distributions satisfying the canonical commutation relations

$$\big[a(K), a^*(K')\big] = \delta_{\lambda,\lambda'}\delta^{(3)}(k-k') \ \ , \ \ \big[a^\sharp(K), a^\sharp(K')\big] = 0 \ .$$

For brevity, $a^\sharp$ henceforth denotes either a or a^*.

The energy and momentum of a single photon with wave vector k is given by $|k|$ and k, respectively (recalling that in our units, the speed of light and Planck's constant have the value 1). A configuration of n non-interacting photons with wave vectors $k_1,\dots,k_n$ has energy $\sum_{j=1}^n |k_j|$, and momentum $\sum_{j=1}^n k_j$. We define the free field Hamiltonian H_f, and the free field momentum operator P_f, by

$$\begin{aligned}(H_f\Psi)_n(K_1,\dots,K_n) \ &= \ \Big(\sum_{j=1}^n |k_j|\Big)\psi_n(K_1,\dots,K_n) \ , \\ (P_f\Psi)_n(K_1,\dots,K_n) \ &= \ \Big(\sum_{j=1}^n k_j\Big)\psi_n(K_1,\dots,K_n) \ ,\end{aligned} \tag{1.10}$$

and $(H_f\Psi)_0 = 0$, $(P_f\Psi)_0 = 0$. Expressed in terms of creation and annihilation operators,

$$\begin{aligned}H_f \ &= \ \int dK\, a^*(K)\,|k|\,a_\lambda(K) \ , \\ P_f \ &= \ \int dK\, a^*(K)\, k\, a(K) \ ,\end{aligned} \tag{1.11}$$

which are defined as weak integrals.

The states of an electron coupled to the quantized electromagnetic field are elements of the tensor product Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{el} \otimes \mathcal{F} \ .$$

The model studied in this paper is defined by the Hamiltonian

$$H_{QED} = \frac{1}{2}\big(i\nabla_{x_{el}} \otimes \mathbf{1}_f - gA_{\kappa_\sigma}(x_{el})\big)^2 + \mathbf{1}_{el} \otimes H_f \ . \tag{1.12}$$

Here, $A_{\kappa_\sigma}(x_{el})$ denotes the (regularized) quantized vector potential defined by

$$A_{\kappa_\sigma}(x_{el}) := \int \frac{dK}{|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}}\, \kappa_\sigma(|k|)\big(\epsilon(K)e^{i\langle k, x_{el}\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}} \otimes\, a_\lambda(k) + h.c.\big) \ . \tag{1.13}$$

It couples the electron to the degrees of freedom of the quantized electromagnetic field. Moreover, g denotes a coupling constant corresponding to the electron charge. Given an infrared regularization parameter $\sigma \geq 0$, $\kappa_\sigma \in C_0^\infty([0,1];\mathbb{R}_+)$ is assumed to be a smooth cutoff function obeying

$$0 < \|\kappa_\sigma\|_\sigma + \|x^\sigma \partial_x\big(x^{-\sigma}\kappa_\sigma\big)\|_\sigma < 10 \tag{1.14}$$

and

$$\lim_{x\to 0}\frac{\kappa_\sigma(x)}{x^\sigma}=1\ , \tag{1.15}$$

where

$$\|f\|_\sigma := \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}_+}|x^{-\sigma}f(x)|\ . \tag{1.16}$$

Most of the time, we have $\sigma > 0$, although we are really interested in the limit $\sigma \searrow 0$.

By translation invariance of the system, we may write $\mathcal{H}$ as a direct integral with respect to the total momentum operator

$$P_{tot} = i\nabla_{x_{el}}\otimes \mathbf{1}_f + \mathbf{1}_{el}\otimes P_f\ , \tag{1.17}$$

given by

$$\mathcal{H} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3}^{\oplus} d^3p\,\mathcal{H}_p\ . \tag{1.18}$$

Each fiber Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_p$, labeled by a vector $p\in\mathbb{R}^3$ corresponding to the conserved total momentum, is isomorphic to $\mathcal{F}$, and invariant with respect to the unitary time evolution $e^{-itH_{QED}}$.

By invariance of $\mathcal{H}_p$ under the unitary evolution generated by H_{QED}, it suffices to study the restriction of H_{QED} to the fibers $\mathcal{H}_p$, which we denote by $H(p,\sigma)$ (the fiber Hamiltonian on $\mathcal{H}_p$). Thus, for any fixed $p\in\mathbb{R}^3$,

$$\begin{aligned} H(p,\sigma) &= H_f+\frac{1}{2}\big(p-P_f-gA_{\kappa_\sigma}\big)^2 \\ &= \frac{|p|^2}{2}+H_f-|p|P_f^{\|}-g|p|A_{\kappa_\sigma}^{\|}+\frac{1}{2}\big(P_f+gA_{\kappa_\sigma}\big)^2\ , \end{aligned} \tag{1.19}$$

where $A_{\kappa_\sigma} := A_{\kappa_\sigma}(0)$. We are using the notation

$$v^{\|} := \langle v, n_p\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}\ \ ,\ \ n_p := \frac{p}{|p|}\ \ ,\ \ v^{\perp} := v - v^{\|}n_p \tag{1.20}$$

for $0\neq p, v\in\mathbb{R}^3$.

2. Statement of the main results

We study the spectrum of the fiber Hamiltonian $H(p,\sigma)$ in the vicinity of its infimum $E(p,\sigma)$. We prove that $E(p,\sigma)$ is a simple eigenvalue and construct the corresponding eigenvector $\Psi(p,\sigma)\in\mathcal{F}\cong\mathcal{H}_p$ provided that either $\sigma>0$ and $0<|p|<\frac{1}{3}$ or $\sigma\geq 0$ if $p=0$. The vector $\Psi(p,\sigma)$ is an *infraparticle state*, describing a compound particle comprising the electron together with a cloud of low-energy (soft) photons whose expected number diverges as $\sigma\to 0$, unless $p=0$. One of our main goals in this paper is to determine the *renormalized electron mass*.

The renormalized electron mass can be defined as follows. Let $\mathrm{Hess}\,E(p,\sigma)$ denote the Hessian of $E(p,\sigma)$ at $p\in\mathbb{R}^3$. We compute

$$\big(\mathrm{Hess}\,E(p,\sigma)\big)_{ij} = \big(\delta_{ij}-\frac{p_ip_j}{|p|^2}\big)\frac{\partial_{|p|}E(p,\sigma)}{|p|}+\frac{p_ip_j}{|p|^2}\partial_{|p|}^2E(p,\sigma)\ . \tag{2.1}$$

As a linear map, it has a simple radial eigenvalue $\partial_{|p|}^2 E(p,\sigma)$, and a tangential eigenvalue $\frac{\partial_{|p|} E(p,\sigma)}{|p|}$ of multiplicity two. If $p=0$ the Hessian simplifies to a multiple of the identity, $\partial_{|p|}^2 E(0,\sigma)\mathbf{1}_3$. We shall refer to the radial eigenvalue

$$m_{ren}(p,\sigma) := \frac{1}{\partial_{|p|}^2 E(p,\sigma)} \tag{2.2}$$

as the renormalized electron mass.

One of our main purposes in the present paper is to study $m_{ren}(p,\sigma)$. If $p \neq 0$, we shall derive bounds on $m_{ren}(p,\sigma)$ which are *not* uniform in σ. Uniform bounds are beyond the scope of this work and are established in [5]. A corollary of the results in [5] is that

$$\lim_{\sigma\to 0}\lim_{p\to 0} m_{ren}(p,\sigma) = \lim_{p\to 0}\lim_{\sigma\to 0} m_{ren}(p,\sigma)\ . \tag{2.3}$$

In the literature, $m_{ren}(0,0)$ is the most common definition of the renormalized mass. In the present work, we assume the commutativity of the limits in (2.3); see condition (14.8) below, and [5] for a proof. Under this condition we prove uniform bounds in the $p=0$ case. We emphasize that our bounds on $m_{ren}(0,\sigma)$ are constructive and can be used to devise an algorithm to compute the renormalized mass to any given precision.

Theorem 2.1. *Assume that $0 \le |p| < \frac{1}{3}$. Let $E(p,\sigma)$ denote the infimum of the spectrum of the fiber Hamiltonian $H(p,\sigma)$ defined in (1.19), where $\sigma > 0$ if $p \neq 0$, and $\sigma \ge 0$ if $p = 0$.*

- *A. The case $p \neq 0$: For any $\sigma > 0$, there exists a constant $g_0(\sigma) > 0$ such that, for all $0 \le g < g_0(\sigma)$, $H(p,\sigma)$ has an eigenvalue $E(p,\sigma)$ of multiplicity one at the bottom of absolutely continuous spectrum. Moreover, there is a finite constant $c_0(\sigma) > 0$ independent of g such that*

  $$\Big| E(p,\sigma) - \frac{|p|^2}{2} - \frac{g^2}{2}\langle \Omega, A_{\kappa_\sigma}^2 \Omega\rangle \Big| < c_0(\sigma)\,\frac{g^2|p|^2}{2}\ ,$$

  with

  $$\Big| \partial_{|p|} E(p,\sigma) - |p| \Big| \le c_0(\sigma) g^2 |p|$$

  and

  $$0 < 1 - \partial_{|p|}^2 E(p,\sigma) \le c_0(\sigma) g^2\ .$$

  Consequently,

  $$1 < m_{ren}(p,\sigma) < 1 + c_0(\sigma) g^2\ , \tag{2.4}$$

  where

  $$m_{ren}(p,\sigma) = \frac{1}{\partial_{|p|}^2 E(p,\sigma)} \tag{2.5}$$

  is the renormalized mass.
- *B. The case $p = 0$: There is a constant $g_0 > 0$* independent *of $\sigma \ge 0$ such that, for arbitrary $\sigma \ge 0$ and for any $0 \le g < g_0$, $H(0,\sigma)$ has an eigenvalue $E(0,\sigma)$ of multiplicity one at the bottom of absolutely continuous spectrum.*

There are finite constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ independent *of* g, p *and* $\sigma \geq 0$ *such that*

$$0 < E(0,\sigma) \leq c_1 g^2 \; .$$

Moreover

$$(\partial_{|p|} E)(0,\sigma) = 0 \; ,$$

and

$$1 < m_{ren}(0,\sigma) \leq 1 + c_2 g^2 \; .$$

Assuming condition (2.3) (corresponding to (14.8) below),

$$\lim_{p\to 0} \lim_{\sigma \to 0} m_{ren}(p,\sigma) = 1 + \tilde{c}_2 g^2 + O(g^{\frac{7}{3}}) \; , \tag{2.6}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{c}_2 &= \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \lim_{\sigma\to 0} \Big\langle \Omega \, , \, A_\kappa \Big[H_f + \frac{1}{2} P_f^2 + \epsilon \Big]^{-1} A_\kappa \Omega \Big\rangle \\ &= \frac{8\pi}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} dx \, \frac{\kappa^2(x)}{1 + \frac{x}{2}} \; , \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

and $\kappa(x) := \lim_{\sigma\to 0} \kappa_\sigma(x)$*.*

2.1. **Discussion.** The renormalized mass $m_{ren}(0,0)$ can be determined perturbatively. For a sharp ultraviolet cutoff at Λ, and setting the bare mass equal to 1, the ground state energy has the form

$$E(p,0) = E_0 + \frac{p^2}{2 m_{ren}(0,0)} + O(p^4) \tag{2.8}$$

where to leading order in g,

$$E_0 \approx \frac{2\pi g^2 \Lambda^2}{3} \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|p|^2}{2 m_{ren}(0,0)} &\approx \frac{|p|^2}{2} \big(1 - \frac{16\pi}{3} g^2 \log(1 + \frac{\Lambda}{2}) \big) \\ &\approx \frac{|p|^2}{2} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{16\pi}{3} g^2 \log(1 + \frac{\Lambda}{2})} \; , \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

so that

$$m_{ren}(0,0) \approx 1 + \frac{16\pi}{3} g^2 \log(1 + \frac{\Lambda}{2}) \; . \tag{2.11}$$

This agrees with (2.6) and (2.7). (It is a common convention to include a factor $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ in the definition (1.13), whereby g corresponds to $\frac{\tilde{g}}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $\frac{16\pi g^2}{3}$ to $\frac{8\pi \tilde{g}^2}{3}$.) A presentation of the leading order calculations producing these results can for instance be found in [14]. An important result of this paper is that the right hand side of (2.11) is the correct value of the renormalized mass, up to an error $o(g^2)$.

Note that (2.9) and (2.11) depend on the ultraviolet cutoff Λ. Throughout this paper, we choose Λ to be $O(1)$. We do not study ultraviolet renormalization, i.e., we do not worry about the dependence of E_0 and $m_{ren}(0,0)$ when $\Lambda \to \infty$. For some preliminary results see [7, 9, 11, 12], and [14] for a recent survey.

Remark 2.2. *The upper bound on* $|p|$ *of* $\frac{1}{3}$ *is not optimal, but we note that, for* $E(p,\sigma)$ *to be an eigenvalue,* $|p|$ *cannot exceed a critical value* $p_c < 1$ *(corresponding to the speed of light). As* $|p| \to p_c$*, it is expected that the eigenvalue at* $E(p,\sigma)$ *dissolves in the continuous spectrum, while a resonance appears. This is a manifestation of a phenomenon analogous to Cherenkov radiation.*

Remark 2.3. *Our analysis is based on the operator-theoretic renormalization group method involving the* smooth Feshbach map*, which is developed in* [1]*. This method provides a convergent expansion for both* $E(0,0)$ *and* $m_{ren}(0,0)$ *in powers of the feinstructure constant* $\alpha = \frac{g^2}{4\pi}$*, with coefficients that are themselves functions of* α*. It is a subtle and significant issue that the latter diverge in the limit* $\alpha \to 0$ *like* $\alpha^{-\epsilon}$*, where* $\epsilon > 0$ *is arbitrarily small. Note that* $E(0,0)$ *and* $m_{ren}(0,0)$ cannot *be represented as a convergent power series in* α*.*

Remark 2.4. *Inequality (2.5) expresses the fact that the mass of the electron is increased by interactions with the photon field.*

Remark 2.5. *A priori, the constant* $c_2(\sigma)$ *in (2.4) might diverge in the limit* $\sigma \to 0$*; but one can prove bounds that are uniform in* σ*, see* [5]*. In this work, we prove* $c(\sigma) < C^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}$ *for an explicitly computable constant* C *which is independent of* g *and* σ*.*

Remark 2.6. *The operator-theoretic renormalization group method provides a* convergent, finite algorithm *for determining the values of* $E(0,0)$ *and* $m_{ren}(0,0)$ *to arbitrary precision.*

Remark 2.7. *The existence of the ground state at* $p = 0$ *for* $\sigma = 0$*, and renormalization of the electron mass is an important ingredient for the phenomenon of* enhanced binding*,* [6] *and* [10, 8]*. A Schrödinger operator with a non-confining potential can exhibit a bound state when the interaction of the electron with the quantized electromagnetic field is included. Binding to a shallow potential can be energetically more favorable for the electron than forming an infraparticle through binding of a cloud of soft photons.*

Remark 2.8. *As stated above, in this paper we use an operator-theoretic renormalization group method based on the "smooth Feshbach map", in order to prove our main result (Theorem 2.1) and, in particular, to determine* $m_{ren}(0,0)$*. This method has been developed in* [1]*. We expect that, alternatively, A. Pizzo's method of iterated (analytic) perturbation theory* [13] *could be used to reach the same goals. In fact, Pizzo's method has been shown to be applicable to the problem of determining the ground state and the ground state energy of a hydrogen atom interacting with the quantized radiation field, see* [2]*, which is similar to the problem solved in this paper.*

3. Strategy and organization of the proof

The purpose of this section is to outline the key steps and analytical methods used in our proof of Theorem 2.1.

3.1. **Smooth Feshbach map.** An important functional-analytic tool that we employ to establish Theorem 2.1 is the *smooth Feshbach map*, [1]. This is an essential ingredient of the operator-theoretic renormalization group method and is addressed in detail in Section 4.1. Its main features can be summarized as follows.

Let $\mathcal{H}$ denote a separable Hilbert space, let τ and H be closed operators on $\mathcal{H}$, and assume that the operator $\omega := H - \tau$ is defined on the entire domain of τ. We choose a positive operator $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ on $\mathcal{H}$ which, together with $\bar{\chi} := \sqrt{1-\chi^2}$, shall commute with τ and leave the domain of τ invariant. The operators (H, τ) are called a *Feshbach pair* corresponding to χ if the bounds formulated in eq. (4.3), below, are satisfied.

The *smooth Feshbach map* is defined on Feshbach pairs with values in the linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$. It is defined by

$$F_\chi(H,\tau) = H_\chi - \chi\omega\bar{\chi}H_{\bar{\chi}}^{-1}\bar{\chi}\omega\chi \, , \tag{3.1}$$

where

$$H_\chi := \tau + \chi\omega\chi \;\; , \;\; H_{\bar{\chi}} := \tau + \bar{\chi}\omega\bar{\chi} \, . \tag{3.2}$$

A quintessential property of $F_\chi(H,\tau)$ is *(Feshbach) isospectrality* (Theorem 4.2):

- H is bounded invertible on $\mathcal{H}$ if and only if $F_\chi(H,\tau)$ is bounded invertible on $\mathrm{Ran}(\chi)$.
- 0 is an eigenvalue of H with multiplicity n_0 if and only if 0 is an eigenvalue of $F_\chi(H,\tau)$ with the same multiplicity.
- If τ and H are selfadjoint operators on $\mathcal{H}$, then H and $F_\chi(H,\tau)$ are of the same spectral type at 0; see [1] for details.

In this precise sense, the smooth Feshbach map allows us to study the low-energy spectrum of H by analyzing a bounded operator, $F_\chi(H,\tau)$, on a proper *subspace*, $\mathrm{Ran}(\chi)$, of $\mathcal{H}$. The operator-theoretic renormalization group is used to prove (in a recursive fashion) that there is a choice of χ for which $F_\chi(H,\tau)$ is well-defined and such that it can easily be seen that the bottom of the spectrum of $F_\chi(H,\tau)$ consists of a simple eigenvalue. By Feshbach isospectrality, one then concludes that the bottom of the spectrum of H consists of a simple eigenvalue, too.

As compared to the version of the Feshbach map based on sharp projectors, [3, 4], the *smooth* Feshbach map is simpler to handle, analytically (differentiability of the cutoff operators), but somewhat more complicated algebraically, since $\chi\bar{\chi} \neq 0$. All this is discussed in detail in Section 4.5.

3.2. **A Banach space of generalized Wick kernels.** Our key strategy is to relate the spectral problem outlined above to a discrete dynamical system in a Banach space of operators, in the spirit of K. Wilson's formulation of the renormalization group. The first step in this construction is to define this Banach space, cf. section 5.

We consider bounded operators of the form

$$H = E + T[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + W \, , \tag{3.3}$$

on the fixed Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{red} := \mathbf{1}[H_f < 1]\mathcal{F}$, referred to as *effective Hamiltonians*. Here, we have introduced the notation

$$\underline{\mathcal{P}} := (H_f, P_f) \;, \tag{3.4}$$

and we denote the spectral variable corresponding to $\underline{\mathcal{P}}$ by

$$\underline{X} = (X_0, X) \in [0,1] \times B_1 \;, \tag{3.5}$$

where $X = (X_1, X_2, X_3)$.

- In (3.3), E is a complex number which plays the role of a spectral parameter.
- The operator $T[\underline{\mathcal{P}}]$ satisfies $T[\underline{0}] = 0$. It is referred to as the non-interacting, or *free* part of H.
- The operator W, referred to as the interaction part of H, is of the form
$$W = \sum_{M+N \geq 1} W_{M,N} \;,$$
where $W_{M,N}$ is a *generalized Wick monomial* in M creation and N annihilation operators,
$$\begin{aligned} W_{M,N} \;\; = \;\; & \int_{B_1^{M+N}} d\mu^{(M,N)}(K^{(M)}, \tilde{K}^{(N)}) \\ & \qquad a^*(K^{(M)})\, w_{M,N}[\underline{\mathcal{P}}; K^{(M)}, \tilde{K}^{(N)}]\, a(\tilde{K}^{(N)}) \end{aligned}$$
where $K^{(M)} := (K_1, \dots, K_M)$, $\tilde{K}^{(N)} = (\tilde{K}_1, \dots, \tilde{K}_N)$, and where $K_i = (k_i, \lambda_i)$, $\tilde{K}_j = (\tilde{k}_j, \tilde{\lambda}_j)$ are pairs of photon momenta and polarization labels. Furthermore,
$$\begin{aligned} d\mu(K^{(M)}, \tilde{K}^{(N)}) \;\; &:= \;\; \prod_{i=1}^{M} \prod_{j=1}^{N} \frac{dK_i}{\sqrt{|k_i|}} \frac{d\tilde{K}_j}{\sqrt{|\tilde{k}_j|}} \\ a^\sharp(K^{(M)}) \;\; &:= \;\; \prod_{j=1}^{M} a^\sharp(K_j) \;. \end{aligned}$$
The precise definition is given in (5.8) below. $W_{M,N}$ is uniquely determined by its *generalized Wick kernel* $w_{M,N}[\underline{\mathcal{P}}; K^{(M)}, \tilde{K}^{(N)}]$. We note that the singular photon form factors $|k_j|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ are absorbed into the integration measure $d\mu^{(M,N)}$, while the infrared regularization depending on σ is contained in the generalized Wick kernels $w_{M,N}$.

Adapted to (3.3), we introduce a *sequence space of generalized Wick kernels*

$$\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0} = \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathfrak{T} \oplus \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 1} \tag{3.6}$$

that parametrizes the effective Hamiltonians. Here

$$\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 1} = \bigoplus_{M+N \geq 1} \mathfrak{W}_{M,N} \;. \tag{3.7}$$

- $\mathbb{C}$ is the range of E.

- $\mathfrak{T}$ is the space of functions $T[\underline{X}]$ with $T[\underline{0}] = 0$, equipped with the norm
$$\|T\|^\sharp_{\mathfrak{T}} \approx \Big(\sum_{a_0=0,1} + \sum_{0\leq\sum_1^3 a_i\leq 2} \Big) |\partial^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{X}} T| \, .$$
The precise definition of this norm is given in (5.18).
- $\mathfrak{W}_{M,N}$ is the space of functions $w_{M,N}[\underline{X}; K^{(M)}, \tilde{K}^{(N)}]$, equipped with the norm
$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{M,N}\|^\sharp_\sigma \quad \approx \quad & \sup_{\substack{k_i \\ i=1,\dots,M}} \sup_{\substack{\tilde{k}_j \\ j=1,\dots,N}} \sup_{|X|\leq X_0<1} \Big[\prod_{\substack{i=1,\dots,M \\ j=1,\dots,N}} |k_i|^{-\sigma} |\tilde{k}_j|^{-\sigma} \Big] \\ & \times \Big(|k_i|^\sigma |\partial_{|k_i|} |k_i|^{-\sigma} w_{M,N}| + ||k_j|^\sigma \partial_{|\tilde{k}_j|} |k_j|^{-\sigma} w_{M,N}| \\ & + \Big(\sum_{a_0=0,1} + \sum_{1\leq\sum_1^3 a_i\leq 2} \Big) |\partial^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{X}} w_{M,N}| \Big) \, . \end{aligned}$$
The precise definition of this norm is given in (5.14). The factors $|k_i|^{-\sigma}$, $|\tilde{k}_j|^{-\sigma}$ implement the infrared regularization, since finiteness of $\|w_{M,N}\|^\sharp_\sigma$ evidently implies
$$\begin{aligned} & ||k_i|^\sigma \partial_{|k_i|} |k_i|^{-\sigma} w_{M,N}| + ||k_j|^\sigma \partial_{|\tilde{k}_j|} |k_j|^{-\sigma} w_{M,N}| \\ & + \Big(\sum_{a_0=0,1} + \sum_{1\leq\sum_1^3 a_i\leq 2} \Big) |\partial^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{X}} w_{M,N}| \\ & = O\Big(\prod_{i=1,\dots,M} \prod_{j=1,\dots,N} |k_i|^\sigma |\tilde{k}_j|^\sigma \Big) \end{aligned}$$
as $|k_i|, |\tilde{k}_j| \to 0$.

For $\underline{w} = (E, T, \underline{w}_1) \in \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}$ with $\underline{w}_1 := (w_{M,N})_{M+N\geq 1}$, and a fixed number $0 < \xi < 1$, we define the norm

$$\|\underline{w}\|_{\sigma,\xi} = |E| + \|T\|^\sharp_{\mathfrak{T}} + \|\underline{w}_1\|_{\sigma,\xi} \tag{3.8}$$

with

$$\|\underline{w}_1\|_{\sigma,\xi} := \sum_{M+N\geq 1} \xi^{-M-N} \|w_{M,N}\|^\sharp_\sigma \, . \tag{3.9}$$

This endows the space $\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}$ with a Banach space structure. There exists an injective imbedding

$$H : \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{red}) \, , \tag{3.10}$$

such that for every $\underline{w} \in \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}$,

$$H[\underline{w}] = E\mathbf{1} + T[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + W[\underline{w}] \tag{3.11}$$

with

$$W[\underline{w}] := \sum_{M+N\geq 1} W_{M,N}[w_{M,N}] \tag{3.12}$$

is an effective Hamiltonian of the form (3.3). Our norms are chosen such that

$$\|H[\underline{w}]\|_{op} \leq C \|\underline{w}\|_{\sigma,\xi} \, , \tag{3.13}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{op}$ denotes the operator norm on $\mathcal{H}_{red}$.

These constructions are discussed in detail in Section 5.

3.3. **The isospectral renormalization map $\mathcal{R}_\rho$.**

To implement the multiscale approach outlined above, we define an isospectral renormalization transformation that maps a polydisc contained in $\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}$ into itself.

To define the polydisc, we introduce a family of non-interacting comparison theories defined by $T_0^{(p;\lambda)} \in \mathfrak{T}$ with

$$T_0^{(p;\lambda)}[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] \approx H_f - |p| P_f^{\|} + \lambda P_f^2 \ , \tag{3.14}$$

where $P_f^{\|}$ is the projection of P_f onto the conserved momentum p, and $0 \leq \lambda < \frac{1}{2}$ is a real parameter. The effective Hamiltonians in our problem are compared with the free family of theories defined by $T_0^{(p;\lambda)} \in \mathfrak{T}$.

In this spirit, we introduce a *polydisc* $\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda) \subset \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}$ given by

$$\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon,\delta,\lambda) \approx \Big\{ \underline{w} = (E, T, \underline{w}_1) \ \Big| \ E \in D_{\frac{1}{10}} \ , \ \|T - T_0^{(p;\lambda)}\|_{\mathfrak{T}} < \delta \ , \ \|\underline{w}_1\|_{\sigma,\xi} \leq \epsilon \ \Big\} \ , \tag{3.15}$$

where $D_{\frac{1}{10}} := \{ z \in \mathbb{C} \big| |z| < \frac{1}{10} \}$. Let $0 < \rho < \frac{1}{2}$. For $\epsilon, \delta, \lambda$ sufficiently small, and $\underline{w} \in \mathfrak{D}(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda)$, one can verify that $(H[\underline{w}], H_f)$ is a Feshbach pair corresponding to $\chi_\rho[H_f] = \chi_1[\rho^{-1} H_f]$.

We let S_ρ denote the rescaling operator, which acts on creation- and annihilation operators by

$$S_\rho[a^\sharp(K)] = \rho^{-\frac{5}{2}} a^\sharp(\rho^{-1} K) \ \text{ and } \ S_\rho[\mathbf{1}] = \rho^{-1} \mathbf{1} \ . \tag{3.16}$$

(We note that the definition of S_ρ includes multiplication by $\frac{1}{\rho}$. Under unitary scaling, $a^\sharp(K)$ is mapped to $\rho^{-\frac{3}{2}} a^\sharp(\rho^{-1} K)$).

Moreover, we denote by E_ρ a *renormalization of the complex number E.*

The *isospectral renormalization map* is then defined by

$$R_\rho^H[H[\underline{w}]] = \Big(E_\rho \circ S_\rho \circ F_{\chi_\rho[H_f]}(\,\cdot\,, H_f) \Big) [H[\underline{w}]] \ , \tag{3.17}$$

by composing an application of the smooth Feshbach map with a rescaling transformation, cf. section 6.

We next lift R_ρ^H to $\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}$. Given $\underline{w} \in \mathfrak{D}(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda)$, we define a *renormalization map acting on generalized Wick kernels* $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ whose domain is defined by those elements $\underline{w} \in \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}$, for which $R_\rho^H[H[\underline{w}]]$ is well-defined and in the domain of H^{-1}. Accordingly,

$$\mathcal{R}_\rho := H^{-1} \circ R_\rho \circ H \ , \tag{3.18}$$

where $H : \underline{w} \mapsto H[\underline{w}]$. (Note that here the injectivity of H and $R_\rho : \mathrm{Ran}(H) \to \mathrm{Ran}(H)$ are crucial.)

3.4. **Codimension two contraction property of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ on a polydisc.** Our main result in the context of the operator-theoretic renormalization group states that $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ is contractive on a codimension two subspace of $\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon,\delta,\lambda)$. This is a consequence of the following facts.

Let $\underline{w} = (E, T, \underline{w}_1) \in \mathfrak{D}(\epsilon,\delta,\lambda)$, and

$$\widehat{\underline{w}} \;:=\; \mathcal{R}_\rho[\underline{w}] \;=\; (\widehat{E}, \widehat{T}, \widehat{\underline{w}}_1)\;. \tag{3.19}$$

We will show that

$$\widehat{E} = \rho^{-1}(E + O(\epsilon))\;, \tag{3.20}$$

i.e. the spectral parameter E is magnified by a factor $\frac{1}{\rho}$ through the rescaling transformation. The operator $E\mathbf{1}$ thus belongs to a 1-dimensional space of *relevant perturbations*, but by explicit change of variables, implemented by the map E_ρ, this 1-dimensional subspace of operators can be projected out.

We may then restrict our attention to the spaces of marginal and irrelevant perturbations. We shall prove that

$$\|\widehat{T} - T_0^{(p;\rho\lambda)}\|_{\mathfrak{T}} \le \delta + \epsilon\;. \tag{3.21}$$

Thus, under application of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$, the bound in (3.15) involving T is transformed according to $\delta \to \delta + \epsilon$ and $\lambda \to \rho\lambda$. The leading terms in T of the form $\alpha H_f + \beta P_f^{\|}$ are invariant under the rescaling transformation and hence belong to a 2-dimensional space of *marginal perturbations*.

We will prove for the renormalized generalized Wick kernels that

$$\widehat{w}_{M,N} \;=\; \rho^{(\sigma+1)(M+N)-1}\big(w_{M,N} + \Delta w_{M,N}\big) \quad \text{if } p \ne 0 \tag{3.22}$$

and

$$\widehat{w}_{M,N} \;=\; \rho^{\max\{M+N-1,1\}}\big(w_{M,N} + \Delta w_{M,N}\big) \quad \text{if } p = 0\;, \tag{3.23}$$

for $M + N \ge 1$, where (with $\Delta\underline{w}_1 := (\Delta w_{M,N})_{M+N\ge 1}$)

$$\|\Delta\underline{w}_1\|_{\sigma,\xi} < c\epsilon^2\;. \tag{3.24}$$

The powers of ρ are generated by the scaling transformation (that is, by the action of S_ρ on $\mathfrak{W}_{M,N}$; this is explained in Section 6.1.1). The terms $\Delta w_{M,N}$ are produced by the smooth Feshbach map. If $p \ne 0$, every $w_{M,N}$ is contracted by a factor ρ^σ, or smaller, under an application of the renormalization map. In the special case $p = 0$, this factor is given by ρ, *independently* of σ. One obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\underline{w}}_1\|_{\sigma,\xi} &\le \rho^a(\|\underline{w}_1\|_{\sigma,\xi} + \|\Delta\underline{w}_1\|_{\sigma,\xi}) \\ &\le \rho^a(\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2))\;, \end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

where $a = \sigma$ if $p \ne 0$, and $a = 1$ if $p = 0$. Thus, for a suitable choice of ρ (which depends on σ if $p \ne 0$, but not if $p = 0$),

$$\|\widehat{\underline{w}}_1\|_{\sigma,\xi} \;\le\; \frac{\epsilon}{2}\;. \tag{3.26}$$

Thus, from application of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$, $\epsilon \to \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ in the bounds formulated in (3.15).

In conclusion,

$$\mathcal{R}_\rho : \mathfrak{D}(\epsilon,\delta,\lambda) \to \mathfrak{D}(\frac{\epsilon}{2}, \delta+\epsilon, \rho\lambda) \tag{3.27}$$

for all $0 \le \epsilon \le \epsilon_0(\sigma)$, $0 \le \delta \le \delta_0(\sigma) + 2\epsilon_0(\sigma)$ sufficiently small if $p \ne 0$, and for all $0 \le \epsilon \le \epsilon_0$, $0 \le \delta \le \delta_0 + 2\epsilon_0$ sufficiently small (independently of σ) if $p = 0$. Ignoring the subspace of relevant perturbations spanned by $E\mathbf{1}$, which is explicitly projected out, this expresses the *codimension two contraction property* of the renormalization map. The details of this analysis are presented in Section 6.6.

3.5. **The first Feshbach decimation step.** In the first Feshbach decimation step, the fiber Hamiltonian $H(p,\sigma)$ is mapped to an effective Hamiltonian that is used as an initial condition for the renormalization group recursion.

To this end, we verify that for $E \in \frac{|p|^2}{2} + \langle \Omega, A^2_{\kappa_\sigma} \Omega \rangle + D_{\frac{1}{10}}$, and g sufficiently small, $(H(p,\sigma) - E, H_f)$ is a Feshbach pair corresponding to $\chi_1[H_f]$. We then find an element $\underline{w}^{(0)}$ in a polydisc $\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon_0, \delta_0, \frac{1}{2})$ such that

$$H[\underline{w}^{(0)}] = F_{\chi_1[H_f]}(H(p,\sigma) - E, H_f) \; . \tag{3.28}$$

$H[\underline{w}^{(0)}]$ and $H(p,\sigma) - E$ are isospectral in the Feshbach sense. The parameters ϵ_0 and δ_0 are both $O(g)$.

3.6. **The isospectral renormalization group flow.** We assume that the electron charge g, and therefore the parameters ϵ_0, δ_0, are sufficiently small such that $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ is codimension 2 contractive on $\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon_0, \delta_0 + 2\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2})$. If $p \ne 0$, one must assume that $g < g_0(\sigma)$, while if $p = 0$, one can assume that $g < g_0$ independently of σ.

Repeated application of the renormalization map yields a sequence $(\underline{w}^{(n)})_{n \ge 0}$ satisfying $\underline{w}^{(n+1)} = \mathcal{R}_\rho[\underline{w}^{(n)}]$. The index n is referred to as the *scale* of the effective problem obtained after the n-th recursion. The effective Hamiltonian of the scale n is given by

$$H[\underline{w}^{(n)}] = E^{(n)}\mathbf{1} + T^{(n)}[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + W[\underline{w}^{(n)}] \; , \tag{3.29}$$

and has an operator norm bounded by $\|H[\underline{w}^{(n)}]\|_{op} \le c \|\underline{w}^{(n)}\|_{\sigma,\xi}$ on $\mathcal{H}_{red}$.

By (3.27), the *scaling limit* ($n \to \infty$) is characterized by an element $\underline{w}^{(\infty)} \in \mathfrak{D}(0, \delta_0 + 2\epsilon_0, 0)$ in the vicinity of $T_0^{(p;0)}$ relative to the $\| \cdot \|_{\mathfrak{T}}$-norm. That is, $H[\underline{w}^{(\infty)}] = \alpha H_f + \beta P_f^{\|}$, where $|\alpha - 1|, |\beta + |p|| < \delta_0 + 2\epsilon_0$.

Thus, for $\sigma > 0$ and $0 \le |p| < \frac{1}{3}$, or $\sigma = 0$ and $p = 0$, the fixed point set of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ (after elimination of the one-dimensional relevant subspace of perturbations) consists of a 2-dimensional linear center stable manifold that parametrizes a universality class of non-interacting theories. However, we remark that for $\sigma = 0$ and $0 < |p| < \frac{1}{3}$, the generalized Wick kernels $w_{1,0}$ and $w_{0,1}$ (which are hermitean conjugates of one another) are *strictly marginal* operators, as is proven in [5]. Correspondingly, the fixed point set of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ is then given by a 3-dimensional center stable manifold that parametrizes a universality class of theories.

3.7. **Ground state eigenvalue and eigenvector.** In Section 12, we use the isospectral renormalization group to prove the existence of a simple eigenvalue

$E(p,\sigma)$ at the bottom of the spectrum of $H(p,\sigma)$, and to construct the corresponding normalized eigenvector $\Psi(p,\sigma)$ for $\sigma > 0$. In the case $p = 0$, the same is achieved for $\sigma \geq 0$.

Key to this analysis is the fact that the infimum of the spectrum of $H[\underline{w}^{(\infty)}] = \alpha H_f + \beta P_f^{\|}$ is a simple eigenvalue at $\{0\} \in \mathbb{C}$, and the corresponding eigenvector is the Fock vacuum $\Omega \in \mathcal{H}_{red}$. Using Feshbach isospectrality (Theorem 4.2), this suffices to reconstruct the ground state eigenvalue and eigenvector of $H(p,\sigma)$.

3.8. **Soft photon sum rules.** For $\sigma > 0$, it is possible to prove (3.27) along the lines presented in [1]. When $\sigma = 0$ and $p = 0$, additional, new techniques are needed, due to the following subtle and important issue.

Our result states that the interaction is irrelevant even if $\sigma = 0$, provided that $p = 0$. And indeed, based on the naive scaling of the interaction operators in the fiber Hamiltonian $H(p = 0, \sigma)$ (which is notably spherically symmetric), this might seem trivial. However, the argument based on pure scaling is unreliable. Irrelevance of the interaction is a consequence of *symmetries* of the model, but spherical symmetry alone is insufficient. There are simple examples of spherically symmetric models, in which marginal interactions are *generated* from irrelevant ones through the renormalization map. This is a feature of its *non-linearity.*

To treat the case $p = 0$, we exploit a special property of the QED model, which is shared by the Gross transformed Nelson model. In both instances, there exists a hierarchy of non-perturbative identities linking the generalized Wick kernels, referred to as *soft boson sum rules* (or *soft photon sum rules* for QED).

Given $n \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $|n| = 1$, let $\epsilon(n,\lambda)$ denote the photon polarization vector orthonormal to n labeled by the polarization index λ. For $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The sequence of generalized Wick kernels $\underline{w} \in \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}$ is said to satisfy the **soft photon sum rules** $\mathbf{SR}[\mu]$ if the identities

$$\begin{aligned} & g\mu\big\langle \epsilon(n,\lambda)\, , \, \partial_X \big\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} \, w_{M,N}[\underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}] \\ & \quad = (M+1) \lim_{x\to 0} x^{-\sigma} w_{M+1,N}[\underline{X}; K^{(M+1)}, \tilde{K}^{(N)}]\Big|_{K_{M+1}=(xn,\lambda)} \\ & \quad = (N+1) \lim_{x\to 0} x^{-\sigma} w_{M,N+1}[\underline{X}; K^{(M)}, \tilde{K}^{(N+1)}]\Big|_{\tilde{K}_{N+1}=(xn,\lambda)} \end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

hold for all $M, N \geq 0$, and every choice of the unit vector n. We recall that X denotes the spectral variable corresponding to P_f.

Both the generalized Wick kernels of the Wick ordered fiber Hamiltonian $H(p,\sigma)$, and $\underline{w}^{(0)}$ satisfy $\mathbf{SR}[1]$. The value $\mu = 1$ is a consequence of the normalization condition (1.15). Under the action of the renormalization map $\mathcal{R}_\rho$, $\mathbf{SR}[\mu]$ is mapped to $\mathbf{SR}[\rho^\sigma \mu]$. This is proved in section 8. Therefore, $\underline{w}^{(n)}$ satisfies $\mathbf{SR}[\rho^{n\sigma}]$.

In QED, the soft photon sum rules can be viewed as a generalization of the differential Ward-Takahashi identities. However, the existence of soft boson sum rules is not necessarily linked to the presence of a gauge symmetry. The Nelson model, for instance, admits soft boson sum rules, but does not exhibit a gauge symmetry; cf. our remarks in Section 3.11. The soft photon sum rules for the QED model are discussed in detail in Section 6.5 and proven to be preserved by $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ in Section 8. Then, in Sections 9 and 10, we establish the codimension 2 contraction property of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ stated above. In every application of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$, the soft photon sum rules imply the *precise cancellation* of all potentially *marginal* terms.

3.9. **Determination of the renormalized mass.** To bound the first and second derivative of $E(p,\sigma)$ (which is a function only of $|p|$) with respect to $|p|$, we use the *Feynman-Hellman formula*

$$\partial_{|p|}E(p,\sigma) = \frac{\big\langle \Psi(p,\sigma)\,,\,(\partial_{|p|}H)(p,\sigma)\Psi(p,\sigma)\big\rangle}{\big\langle \Psi(p,\sigma)\,,\,\Psi(p,\sigma)\big\rangle}\;, \tag{3.31}$$

from which it will follow that

$$\partial^2_{|p|}E(p,\sigma) = 1 - 2\frac{\big\langle (\partial_{|p|}\Psi)(p,\sigma)\,,\,(H(p,\sigma)-E(p,\sigma))(\partial_{|p|}\Psi)(p,\sigma)\big\rangle}{\big\langle \Psi(p,\sigma)\,,\,\Psi(p,\sigma)\big\rangle}\;. \tag{3.32}$$

Eq. (3.32) makes it evident that $m_{ren}(p,\sigma) > 1$. Exploiting algebraic identities satisfied by the smooth Feshbach map, (3.32) can be directly used to derive the bounds asserted in (2.4), for $p \neq 0$, and $\sigma > 0$.

For $p = 0$, our aim is to find an estimate $1 < m_{ren}(0,\sigma) < 1 + cg^2$ with c *uniform in* σ, as $\sigma \to 0$. The key to our method is an understanding of how important physical quantities, such as the renormalized electron mass, can be extracted from the flow of effective Hamiltonians.

We notice that there are different ways to extract the renormalized mass from the renormalization flow of effective Hamiltonians. One observes in

$$H(p,\sigma) \;=\; \frac{|p|^2}{2m} + H_f - \frac{1}{m}|p|P_f^{\|} + \frac{1}{2m}P_f^2 - \frac{g}{m}|p|A^{\|}_{\kappa_\sigma} + \frac{g}{m}\big\langle P_f\,,\,A_{\kappa_\sigma}\big\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} + \frac{g^2}{2m}A^2_{\kappa_\sigma}$$

that the inverse of the mass appears in six terms (under the normalization condition that the coefficient of H_f is 1). Gauge invariance suggests that the inverse renormalized mass can be determined either through the second derivative in $|p|$ of the ground state energy (as above), or through the quotient between the coefficient of P_f^2 and the coefficient of H_f, or through the quotient between the coefficient of one of the other operators and the coefficient of H_f.

Instead of calculating the second derivative of the ground state energy with respect to $|p|$, we shall, in the case $p = 0$, determine the renormalized mass from the coefficients of the operators P_f^2 and H_f in the Taylor expansion of the effective Hamiltonians in $\underline{P}$, via

$$\frac{1}{m^*_{ren}(0,\sigma)} := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\rho^{-k}\big\langle \Omega\,,\,(\partial^2_{P_f^{\|}}T^{(n)})\Big|_{p=0}\Omega\big\rangle}{\big\langle \Omega\,,\,(\partial_{H_f}T^{(n)})\Big|_{p=0}\Omega\big\rangle}\;. \tag{3.33}$$

Let

$$\Delta T^{(n)}[\underline{P};p] := \rho T^{(n)}[\rho^{-1}\underline{P};p] - T^{(n-1)}[\underline{P};p] \tag{3.34}$$

denote the correction of $T^{(n)}$ due to an application of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$. For $p = 0$, we define

$$\Delta\gamma_1^{(n)} := \big(\partial_{H_f}\Delta T^{(n)}\big)[\underline{0};0] \;\;,\;\; \Delta\gamma_2^{(n)} \;:=\; \big(\partial^2_{P_f}\Delta T^{(n)}\big)[\underline{0};0]\;. \tag{3.35}$$

We then derive the formula

$$\frac{1}{m^*_{ren}(0,\sigma)} = \frac{1+\sum_{n=-1}^{\infty}\rho^{-n_+}\Delta\gamma_2^{(n)}}{1+\sum_{n=-1}^{\infty}\Delta\gamma_1^{(n)}} \,, \tag{3.36}$$

where $n_+ = \max\{n, 0\}$. The $n = -1$ term accounts for the first decimation step. The full discussion is given in Section 14. From the uniform bounds on the sums in the numerator and denominator (owing to the fact that the operator P_f^2 in $T^{(n)}$ is irrelevant), we then arrive at an upper bound on $m^*_{ren}(0,\sigma) - 1 > 0$ which is uniform in σ. We show that $m^*_{ren}(0,\sigma) = m_{ren}(0,\sigma)$ for $\sigma > 0$. By condition (2.2), we then find $\lim_{\sigma\to 0} m_{ren}(0,\sigma) = \lim_{p\to 0}\lim_{\sigma\to 0} m_{ren}(p,\sigma)$. This implies a bound on the renormalized electron mass for $p = 0$ which is *uniform* in σ.

3.10. **New techniques.**

In this paper, we introduce some new techniques that can be expected to be useful in a much broader context. Among those, we particularly point out the following.

One of the key new methods entails the soft photon sum rules. These establish a hierarchy of non-perturbative identities that are here used to prove the precise cancellation of potentially marginal terms in $w_{0,1}$ and $w_{1,0}$ for $p = 0$. In [5], they are also used to prove strict marginality of $w_{0,1}$ and $w_{1,0}$ for $p \neq 0$.

We introduce a method to determine renormalized physical parameters, such as the renormalized mass, by following the renormalization group flow of effective Hamiltonians. Key to the technique is a method to directly relate the fiber Hamiltonian $H(p,\sigma)$ to the effective Hamiltonian $H[\underline{w}^{(n)}]$ at the scale n, for arbitrarily large, finite n. The corresponding identity is presented in Lemma 15.2. The proof is based on the recursive use of the important identity (4.11). Lemma 15.2 allows us to prove equality of the expression (3.32) for the inverse renormalized mass $m_{ren}(0,\sigma)$, obtained from the Feynman-Hellman formula, to the definition (3.33) of $m^*_{ren}(0,\sigma)$, which only depends on $H[\underline{w}^{(n)}]$.

The smooth Feshbach map, in the form used here, has the advantage that arbitrarily high derivatives with respect to H_f can in principle be applied to the effective Hamiltonians. Moreover, derivatives in H_f can simply be estimated in operator norm. In the case of the Feshbach map based on sharp projectors, only the first derivative in H_f could be accommodated, and the delta distributions arising therefrom burdened the analysis. However, the price of using the smooth Feshbach map is that, due to the non-vanishing of overlaps $\chi\bar{\chi} \neq 0$, the algebraic side of the analysis is somewhat more complicated. In this paper, we introduce many new methods, interspersed throughout the text, to efficiently deal with overlap phenomena.

3.11. **Relations to Nelson's model.**

The analysis developed here for the QED model is applicable to Nelson's model with minor modifications. The latter describes a non-relativistic, scalar particle which interacts with a field of scalar bosons. The Hilbert space is given by

$$\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)\otimes\mathcal{F}_{bos} \,, \tag{3.37}$$

with

$$\mathcal{F}_{bos} := \bigoplus_{n\geq 0} \big(L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)\big)^{\otimes_s n}$$

denoting a Fock space of scalar bosons. Introducing creation- and annihilation operators $a^\sharp(k)$, as above (except for the absence of polarization labels), the Hamiltonian of the system is then defined by

$$\begin{aligned} H_{Nelson}(\sigma) \quad &= \quad \frac{1}{2}\big(i\nabla_x \otimes \mathbf{1}_f + \mathbf{1} \otimes P_{bos}\big)^2 + \mathbf{1} \otimes H_{bos} \\ &\quad +g\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d^3k\, v_\sigma(k)\big(e^{-i\langle k,x\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}} \otimes a^*(k) + e^{i\langle k,x\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}} \otimes a(k)\big)\ , \end{aligned} \tag{3.38}$$

where $v_\sigma(k) := \frac{\kappa_\sigma(|k|)}{|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}}$, and where g is a small coupling constant. H_{bos} and P_{bos} are the Hamiltonian and momentum operator of the free boson field, defined in the same manner as in QED. By translation invariance, it again suffices to consider the restriction of $H_{Nelson}(\sigma)$ to a fiber Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_p$, labeled by the conserved total momentum $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$,

$$H_{Nelson}(p,\sigma) \quad = \quad \frac{1}{2}\big(p - P_{bos}\big)^2 + H_{bos} + ga^*(v_\sigma) + ga(v_\sigma)\ . \tag{3.39}$$

We then apply a *Bogoliubov transformation*,

$$H_{Nelson}(p,\sigma) \mapsto H_{BN}(p,\sigma) := U_{Bog,\sigma}\, H_{Nelson}(p,\sigma)\, U^*_{Bog,\sigma}\ , \tag{3.40}$$

by which

$$a^\sharp(k) \to a^\sharp(k) - |k|^{-1} v_\sigma(k)\ . \tag{3.41}$$

The operator $U_{Bog,\sigma}$ is unitary if $\sigma > 0$, but in the limit $\sigma \to 0$, the image of $\mathcal{F}$ under $U_{Bog,\sigma}$ lies in a Hilbert space carrying a representation of the canonical commutation relations inequivalent to the Fock representation.

The Bogoliubov-transformed Nelson Hamiltonian at fixed conserved total momentum p is given by

$$H_{BN}(p,\sigma) = \frac{1}{2}\big(p - P_{bos} - ga(w_\sigma) - ga^*(w_\sigma)\big)^2 + H_{bos}\ , \tag{3.42}$$

where $w_\sigma(k) := v_\sigma(k)\frac{k}{|k|}$ is a vector-valued function in the boson momentum space.

A very important issue in the context of the operator-theoretic renormalization group method, in which the Nelson model may differ from the QED model, is whether it admits soft boson sum rules or not. The answer is affirmative, even though Nelson's model has no gauge symmetry. The soft boson sum rules of the Bogoliubov transformed Nelson model differ from those presented in Section 6.5 for the QED model only in the replacement of the photon polarization vector $\epsilon(K)$ appearing in the definition (6.30) by the radial unit vector $\frac{k}{|k|}$. Correspondingly, all steps in the analysis presented here for $H_{QED}(p,\sigma)$ apply, with minor modifications, to $H_{BN}(p,\sigma)$. Consequently, the results of the present work can be extended to the infrared mass renormalization for the Nelson model.

4. The smooth Feshbach map

We present key properties of the *smooth Feshbach map* in this section. This functional analytical tool was introduced in [1], and generalizes the standard Feshbach map based on sharp projectors in [3, 4]. We refer to [1] for a detailed exposition and for proofs.

4.1. **Feshbach pairs and smooth Feshbach map.**

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a separable Hilbert space. We introduce a pair of selfadjoint operators $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ and $\bar\chi := \sqrt{1-\chi^2}$, acting on $\mathcal{H}$, thus obtaining a partition of unity through $\chi^2 + \bar\chi^2 = \mathbf{1}$. Let P_χ, $P_{\bar\chi}$ denote the orthoprojectors onto the subspaces $\mathrm{Ran}(\chi)$, $\mathrm{Ran}(\bar\chi) \subset \mathcal{H}$, and $P_\chi^\perp = \mathbf{1} - P_\chi$, $P_{\bar\chi}^\perp = \mathbf{1} - P_{\bar\chi}$ their respective complements. Clearly, $\mathrm{Ran}(\chi)$ and $\mathrm{Ran}(\bar\chi)$ are disjoint if and only if χ is a projector.

Definition 4.1. *A pair of closed operators (H, τ) acting on $\mathcal{H}$ is called a Feshbach pair corresponding to χ if:*

- $\mathrm{Dom}(H) = \mathrm{Dom}(\tau) \subset \mathcal{H}$, *$\chi$ and $\bar\chi$ map* $\mathrm{Dom}(H)$ *to itself, and* $[\chi, \tau] = 0 = [\bar\chi, \tau]$.
- *Let*

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\bar\chi} &:= \tau + \bar\chi\omega\bar\chi \\ \omega &:= H - \tau\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

  The operators τ and $H_{\bar\chi}$ are bounded invertible on $\mathrm{Ran}(\bar\chi)$.
- *Let*

$$\bar R := H_{\bar\chi}^{-1}\,, \tag{4.2}$$

  and let $H_{\bar\chi} = U|H_{\bar\chi}|$ denote the polar decomposition of $H_{\bar\chi}$ on $\mathrm{Ran}\bar\chi$. *Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar R\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} &< \infty \\ \big\||\bar R|^{\frac12} U^{-1}\bar\chi\omega\chi\big\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathrm{Ran}(\chi),\mathcal{H})} &\quad,\quad \big\|\chi\omega\;\bar\chi|\bar R|^{\frac12}\big\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H},\mathrm{Ran}(\chi))} < \infty\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

We denote by

$$\mathfrak{FP}(\mathcal{H}, \chi) \tag{4.4}$$

the set of all Feshbach pairs on $\mathcal{H}$ that correspond to χ.

The *smooth Feshbach map* is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} F_\chi : \mathfrak{FP}(\mathcal{H}, \chi) &\to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})\,, \\ (H, \tau) &\mapsto \tau + \chi\,\omega\,\chi - \chi\,\omega\,\bar\chi\,\bar R\,\bar\chi\,\omega\,\chi\,, \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

We note that on the subspace $\mathrm{Ran}(P_\chi^\perp)$, $F_\chi(H, \tau)$ is simply τ, and thus commutes with $\chi, \bar\chi$. On $\mathrm{Ran}(P_\chi)$, $F_\chi(H, \tau)$ defines a bounded operator in $\mathcal{B}(\mathrm{Ran}(P_\chi))$. We also introduce *intertwining maps*

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\chi : \mathfrak{FP}(\mathcal{H}, \chi) &\to \mathcal{B}(\mathrm{Ran}(\chi), \mathcal{H})\,, \\ (H, \tau) &\mapsto \chi\, -\, \bar\chi\,\bar R\,\bar\chi\,\omega\,\chi\,, \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\chi^\sharp : \mathfrak{F}\mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{H},\chi) &\to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{Ran}(\chi)) \ , \\ (H,\tau) &\mapsto \chi - \chi\,\omega\,\bar\chi\,\bar R\,\bar\chi \ . \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

We shall next discuss the properties of these operators that are needed in the present work.

The smooth Feshbach map and the intertwining operators possess very powerful spectral properties, which we describe in the sequel. Moreover, we present a number of crucial algebraic identities which will be of great use later.

4.2. **Feshbach isospectrality.** The smooth Feshbach map establishes a non-linear, isospectral map between operators on $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathrm{Ran}(\chi)$ according to the following theorem.

Theorem 4.2. *(Feshbach isospectrality theorem) Assume that* $(H,\tau) \in \mathfrak{F}\mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{H},\chi)$. *Then, the following hold.*

- *(Isospectrality)* H *is bounded invertible on* $\mathcal{H}$ *if and only if* $F_\chi(H,\tau)$ *is bounded invertible on* $\mathrm{Ran}(\chi)$. *If* H *is invertible,*

$$F_\chi(H,\tau)^{-1} = \chi H^{-1}\chi + \bar\chi\tau^{-1}\bar\chi \tag{4.8}$$

and

$$H^{-1} = Q_\chi(H,\tau)F_\chi(H,\tau)^{-1}Q_\chi^\sharp(H,\tau) + \bar\chi\,\bar R\,\bar\chi \ . \tag{4.9}$$

- *Let* $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$. *Then,* $H\psi = 0$ *if and only if* $F_\chi(H,\tau)\chi\psi = 0$ *on* $\mathrm{Ran}(\chi)$.
- *(Reconstruction of an eigenvector) Let* $\zeta \in \mathrm{Ran}(\chi)$. *Then,* $F_\chi(H,\tau)\zeta = 0$ *if and only if* $HQ_\chi(H,\tau)\zeta = 0$.

The identities formulated in the following lemma will be very important later (to relate "effective Hamiltonians" on different scales to one another).

Lemma 4.3. *Let* $(H,\tau) \in \mathfrak{F}\mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{H},\chi)$. *Then, the following identities hold.*

$$\begin{aligned} \chi F_\chi(H,\tau) &= HQ_\chi(H,\tau) \\ F_\chi(H,\tau)\chi &= Q_\chi^\sharp(H,\tau)H \ , \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

and

$$Q_\chi^\sharp(H,\tau)HQ_\chi(H,\tau) = F_\chi(H,\tau) - F_\chi(H,\tau)\bar\chi\tau^{-1}\bar\chi F_\chi(H,\tau) \ . \tag{4.11}$$

Proof. The proof of (4.10) is given in [1].

To prove (4.11), let for brevity $\omega_A \equiv A\omega A$ for $A = \chi, \bar\chi$. Moreover, let $F \equiv F_\chi(H,\tau)$ and $Q \equiv Q_\chi(H,\tau)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&Q^{\#} H Q - F + F\bar\chi\tau^{-1}\bar\chi F \\
&= \; F\chi Q - F + F\bar\chi\tau^{-1}\bar\chi\big(\tau + \omega_\chi - \chi\omega\bar\chi H_{\bar\chi}^{-1}\bar\chi\omega\chi\big) \\
&= \; F\big(\chi^2 - \chi\bar\chi H_{\bar\chi}^{-1}\bar\chi\omega\chi - \mathbf{1} + \bar\chi\tau^{-1}\bar\chi\tau + \bar\chi\tau^{-1}\bar\chi\omega_\chi \\
&\quad\; -\bar\chi\tau^{-1}\bar\chi\chi\omega\bar\chi H_{\bar\chi}^{-1}\bar\chi\omega\chi\big) \\
&= \; F\big(-\chi\bar\chi H_{\bar\chi}^{-1}\bar\chi\omega\chi + \chi\bar\chi\tau^{-1}\bar\chi\omega\chi - \chi\bar\chi\tau^{-1}\omega_{\bar\chi} H_{\bar\chi}^{-1}\bar\chi\omega\chi\big) \\
&= \; -F\chi\bar\chi\big(H_{\bar\chi}^{-1} - \tau^{-1} + \tau^{-1}\omega_{\bar\chi} H_{\bar\chi}^{-1}\big)\bar\chi\omega\chi \;=\; 0\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we arrive at the assertion of the lemma. □

4.3. **Derivations.** Next, we consider the action of derivations on $F_\chi(H,\tau)$. Consider a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with a dense subspace $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{H}$, and let $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D},\mathcal{H})$ denote the space of linear (not necessarily bounded) operators from $\mathcal{D}$ to $\mathcal{H}$. A derivation δ is a linear map $\mathrm{Dom}(\delta) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D},\mathcal{H})$, defined on a subspace $\mathrm{Dom}(\delta) \subset \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D},\mathcal{H})$, which obeys Leibnitz' rule. That is, for $A, B \in \mathrm{Dom}(\delta)$, $\mathrm{Ran}(B) \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, and $A\,B \in \mathrm{Dom}(\delta)$,

$$\delta[A\,B] = \delta[A]B + A\delta[B]\,.$$

Let $(H,\tau) \in \mathfrak{FP}(\mathcal{H},\chi)$, and assume that $H, \tau \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D},\mathcal{H})$, where $\mathcal{D} := \mathrm{Dom}(H) = \mathrm{Dom}(\tau)$ and that $H, \tau, \chi, \bar\chi$ and the composition of operators in the definition of $F_\chi(H,\tau)$ are contained in $\mathrm{Dom}(\delta)$.

Theorem 4.4. *Assume that $\delta[\bar\chi]$ and $\bar\chi$ are bounded operators which leave $\mathcal{D}$ invariant and commute with τ and with each other. Then, under the above conditions,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta[F_\chi(H,\tau)] \;&=\; \delta[\tau] + \chi\omega\bar\chi\bar R\delta[\tau]\bar R\bar\chi\omega\chi + Q^\sharp\delta[\omega]Q \\
&+\; \delta[\chi]HQ + Q^\sharp H\delta[\chi] \\
&-\; 2\chi\omega\bar\chi\bar R\big(\tau^{-1}\delta[\bar\chi] - \bar R\bar\chi\omega\tau^{-1}\delta[\bar\chi]\big)\,\tau\,\bar R\bar\chi\omega\chi\,.
\end{aligned}$$

If $[\delta[\chi],\bar\chi] = 0 = \delta[\tau]$, this reduces to

$$\delta[F_\chi(H,\tau)] = Q^\sharp\delta[H]Q\,, \tag{4.12}$$

and furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta[Q_\chi(H,\tau)] \;&=\; -\bar\chi\bar R\bar\chi\delta[H]Q_\chi(H,\tau) \\
\delta[Q^\sharp_\chi(H,\tau)] \;&=\; -Q^\sharp_\chi(H,\tau)\delta[H]\bar\chi\bar R\bar\chi
\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

holds for the intertwining operators.

4.4. **Compositions.** Another key aspect of smooth Feshbach maps and intertwining operators concerns their properties under composition. To this end, we consider a pair of mutually commuting, selfadjoint operators $0 \le \chi_1, \chi_2 \le 1$, with $\bar\chi_j := (\mathbf{1} - \chi_j^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Furthermore, let $\chi_1\chi_2 = \chi_2\chi_1 = \chi_2$, such that $\mathrm{Ran}(\chi_2) \subseteq \mathrm{Ran}(\chi_1) \subset \mathcal{H}$. Then, we consider Feshbach pairs

$$\begin{aligned}
(H,\tau_1) \;&\in\; \mathfrak{FP}(\mathcal{H},\chi_1) \\
(H,\tau_2) \;&\in\; \mathfrak{FP}(\mathcal{H},\chi_2) \\
(F_1,\tau_{12}) \;&\in\; \mathfrak{FP}(\mathrm{Ran}(\chi_1),\chi_2)\,,
\end{aligned}$$

with $F_1 := F_{\chi_1}(H,\tau_1)$, and where τ_1, and τ_{12} commute with $\chi_j, \bar\chi_j$.

Theorem 4.5. *Under the above assumptions,*

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\chi_2}(H,\tau_2) &= F_{\chi_2}(F_1,\tau_{12})\,, \\ Q_{\chi_2}(H,\tau_2) &= Q_{\chi_1}(H,\tau_1)\,Q_{\chi_2}(F_1,\tau_{12})\,, \\ Q^{\#}_{\chi_2}(H,\tau_2) &= Q^{\#}_{\chi_2}(F_1,\tau_{12})\,Q^{\#}_{\chi_1}(H,\tau_1)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

if and only if $\tau_2 = \tau_{12}$. *Furthermore,*

$$A\,Q_{\chi_2}(H,\tau_2) = A\,Q_{\chi_2}(F_1,\tau_{12}) \ \ , \ \ Q^{\sharp}_{\chi_2}(H,\tau_2)\,A = Q^{\sharp}_{\chi_2}(F_1,\tau_{12})\,A\,, \tag{4.15}$$

for all operators A *on* $\mathcal{H}$ *that satisfy* $A\bar{\chi}_1 = \bar{\chi}_1 A = 0$.

4.5. **Organizing overlap terms.** For the class of Feshbach pairs $(H,\tau) \in \mathfrak{FP}(\mathcal{H},\chi)$ of interest in the present work, one can write $H = T + W$, where W is a small perturbation of (has a small relative bound with respect to) T. Moreover, $[T,\chi] = 0 = [T,\tau]$, while $[W,\chi], [W,\tau] \neq 0$.

But in contrast to the situation considered in [1], we shall here *not* make the choice $\tau = T$. Consequently, owing to $\chi\bar{\chi} \neq 0$, terms of the form $(T-\tau)\chi\bar{\chi}$, which have a spectral support of small Lebesgue measure, may possess a large operator norm. Hence, it will in general only be possible to study the resummation of resolvent expansions with respect to the operator W, but not with respect to the operator $\omega = H - \tau = T - \tau + W$. Consequently, the algebraic structure of the smooth Feshbach map in the present work is more complicated than in [1]. It is also more complicated than in [3, 4], where $\chi = P$ is a sharp projector, so that $(T-\tau)P\bar{P} = 0$ is trivially true (the operator defined in (4.17) then simply reduces to the identity).

For future use, it will be convenient to introduce an alternative expression for the smooth Feshbach map that makes the separation of ω into large and small terms manifest.

Lemma 4.6. *Let* $(H,\tau) \in \mathfrak{FP}(\mathcal{H},\chi)$, *and assume that* $H = T + W$, *where* $[T,\chi] = [T,\tau] = 0$. *Let*

$$T' := T - \tau \ \text{ and } \ \bar{R}_0 := (\tau + \bar{\chi}T'\bar{\chi})^{-1} \tag{4.16}$$

on $\mathrm{Ran}(\bar{\chi})$. *We introduce the operator*

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_\chi(T,\tau) &:= \mathbf{1} - \bar{\chi}T'\bar{\chi}\bar{R}_0 \\ &= P^{\perp}_{\bar{\chi}} + P_{\bar{\chi}}\tau\bar{R}_0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

on $\mathrm{Ran}(\chi)$, *where* $\mathrm{Ran}(\Upsilon_\chi(T,\tau) - \mathbf{1}) = \mathrm{Ran}(\chi\bar{\chi})$, *and where* $\Upsilon_\chi(T,\tau)$ *commutes with* $\tau, \chi, \bar{\chi}$ *and* T. *Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} F_\chi(H,\tau) \ = \ \tau \ &+ \ \chi T'\Upsilon_\chi(T,\tau)\chi \\ &+ \ \chi\Upsilon_\chi(T,\tau)(W - W\bar{\chi}\bar{R}\bar{\chi}W)\Upsilon_\chi(T,\tau)\chi\,, \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

and in particular, $\Upsilon_\chi = \mathbf{1}$ *if and only if* $\tau = T$.

Proof. Using the second resolvent identity

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{R} &= \bar{R}_0 \, - \, \bar{R}_0\,\bar{\chi}W\bar{\chi}\bar{R} \\ &= \bar{R}_0 \, - \, \bar{R}\,\bar{\chi}W\bar{\chi}\bar{R}_0\,, \end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

and

$$\omega \;=\; T' + W \;,$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned}
F_\chi(H,\tau) \;&=\; \tau + \chi T'\chi + \chi W\chi \\
&\quad -\chi\omega\bar\chi\bar R\bar\chi\omega\chi \\
&=\; \tau + \chi T'\chi - \chi T'\bar\chi\bar R_0\bar\chi T'\chi \\
&\quad +\chi W\chi - \chi W\bar\chi\bar R\bar\chi W\chi \\
&\quad -\chi W\bar\chi\bar R_0\bar\chi T'\chi - \chi T'\bar\chi\bar R_0\bar\chi W\chi \\
&\quad +\chi T'\bar\chi\bar R_0\bar\chi W\bar\chi\bar R_0\bar\chi T'\chi \\
&\quad +\chi T'\bar\chi\bar R_0\bar\chi W\bar\chi\bar R\bar\chi W\chi + \chi W\bar\chi\bar R\bar\chi W\bar\chi\bar R_0\bar\chi T'\chi \\
&\quad -\chi T'\bar\chi\bar R_0\bar\chi W\bar\chi\bar R\bar\chi W\bar\chi\bar R_0\bar\chi T'\chi \\
&=\; \tau + \chi T'\chi - \chi\, T'\bar\chi\bar R_0\bar\chi T'\chi \\
&\quad +\chi(\mathbf{1} - \bar\chi T'\bar\chi\bar R_0)W(\mathbf{1} - \bar\chi T'\bar\chi\bar R_0)\chi \\
&\quad -\chi(\mathbf{1} - \bar\chi T'\bar\chi\bar R_0)W\bar R W(\mathbf{1} - \bar\chi T'\bar\chi\bar R_0)\chi \;.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

From the second line in (4.17) follows immediately that $\Upsilon_\chi = \mathbf{1}$ if and only if $\tau = T$. □

5. Isospectral renormalizaton group: Effective Hamiltonians

Our first step in constructing the framework of the isospectral operator-theoretic renormalization group is to introduce the spaces on which we will introduce an isospectral renormalization transformation. The central objects of interest are *effective Hamiltonians*, which are bounded operators on $\mathcal{H}_{red} = \mathbf{1}[H_f < 1]\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}$ of a generalized Wick ordered normal form.

In Section 5, we define a Banach space of generalized integral (Wick) kernels, which parametrize those effective Hamiltonians.

As a first step, we consider the spectral subspace

$$\mathcal{H}_{red} := \mathbf{1}[H_f < 1]\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F} \;.$$

Furthermore, we choose a smooth cutoff function

$$\chi_1[x] := \sin[\frac{\pi}{2}\Theta(x)] \tag{5.1}$$

of $[0,1)$, with

$$\Theta \in C_0^\infty([0,1);[0,1]) \tag{5.2}$$

and

$$\Theta = 1 \;\text{ on } [0,\frac{3}{4}] \;. \tag{5.3}$$

Moreover, we let

$$\bar\chi_1[x] := \sqrt{1-\chi_1^2[x]} \;.$$

The selfadjoint cutoff operators $\chi_1[H_f]$ and $\bar\chi_1[H_f]$ are defined in the sense of the functional calculus.

We use the notation

$$\underline{\mathcal{P}} := (H_f, P_f) \tag{5.4}$$

and let

$$\begin{aligned} X &= (X_1, X_2, X_3) \in B_1 \ , \\ \underline{X} &= (X_0, X) \in [0,1] \times B_1 \ , \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

denote the corresponding spectral variables, where B_1 is the closed unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

We then introduce operators, referred to as *effective Hamiltonians*, of the particular form

$$H_{eff} = T[\underline{\mathcal{P}}; p] + E\chi_1^2[H_f] + \chi_1[H_f] W[p] \chi_1[H_f] \tag{5.6}$$

which act on $\mathcal{H}_{red}$. They are parametrized by the conserved total momentum $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and depend on a complex parameter E. The function $T[\underline{X}; p]$ can be written in the form

$$T[\underline{X}; p] = X_0 + T'[\underline{X}; p] \ \text{, and } \ T'[\underline{X}; p] = \chi_1^2[X_0] \tilde{T}[\underline{X}; p] \ . \tag{5.7}$$

It satisfies $T[\underline{0}; p] = 0$, is of class C^1 in X_0, and of class C^2 in X. The operator $T[\underline{\mathcal{P}}; p]$, defined in the context of the functional calculus, is referred to as the *non-interacting*, or *free* (part of the effective) Hamiltonian.

The operator $W[p]$ can be written as

$$W[p] = \sum_{M+N \geq 1} W_{M,N}[p] \ ,$$

where the operators in the sum are defined as follows. A *generalized Wick monomial* of degree (M, N), for $M + N \geq 0$, is an Wick ordered polynomial in M creation and N annihilation operators of the form

$$\begin{aligned} W_{M,N}[p] &\equiv W_{M,N}[w_{M,N}] \\ &= P_{red} \int_{B_1^{M+N}} \frac{dK^{(M,N)}}{|k^{(M,N)}|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \, a^*(K^{(M)}) \, w_{M,N}[\underline{\mathcal{P}}; K^{(M,N)}; p] \, a(\tilde{K}^{(N)}) P_{red} \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

where $P_{red} \equiv \mathbf{1}[H_f < 1]$, and where we introduce the notation

$$\begin{aligned} K := (k, \lambda) \quad &\in \quad B_1 \times \{+, -\} \\ K^{(M)} := \big(K_1, \dots, K_M\big) \quad &, \quad k^{(M)} := \big(k_1, \dots, k_M\big) \\ K^{(M,N)} := \big(K^{(M)}, \tilde{K}^{(N)}\big) \quad &, \quad k^{(M,N)} := \big(k^{(M)}, \tilde{k}^{(N)}\big) \\ |k^{(M,N)}| := |k^{(M)}| \cdot |\tilde{k}^{(N)}| \quad &, \quad |k^{(M)}| := |k_1| \cdots |k_M| \\ \underline{k} := (|k|, k) \in [0,1] \times B_1 \quad &, \quad \sum \big[\underline{k}^{(m)}\big] := \underline{k}_1 + \cdots + \underline{k}_m \\ a^\sharp(K^{(M)}) \quad &:= \quad a^\sharp(K_1) \cdots a^\sharp(K_M) \\ dK^{(M)} := \sum_{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_M} d^3k_1 \cdots d^3k_M \quad &, \quad dK^{(M,N)} := dK^{(M)} d\tilde{K}^{(N)} \ . \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the notation

$$\text{” } k \in k^{(M,N)} \text{ ”} \tag{5.9}$$

shall imply $k = k_i$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, or $k = \tilde{k}_j$, for some $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Through (5.8), $W_{M,N}$ is uniquely determined by the *generalized Wick kernel* $w_{M,N}[\underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}; p]$ *of degree* (M, N).

$w_{M,N}$ is separately totally symmetric with respect to the variables $K^{(M)}$ and $\tilde{K}^{(N)}$.

For the problem at hand, we require that the generalized Wick kernels satisfy

$$w_{M,N}[R\underline{X}; RK^{(M,N)}; p] = w_{M,N}[\underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}; R^{-1}p] \tag{5.10}$$

for all $R \in O(3)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} R\underline{X} &:= (X_0, RX) \\ RK^{(M,N)} &:= (RK^{(M)}, R\tilde{K}^{(N)}) \\ RK^{(N)} &:= (RK_1, \dots, RK_N) , \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

and $RK := (Rk, \lambda)$. Likewise, we require that

$$T[X_0, RX; p] = T[\underline{X}; R^{-1}p] \tag{5.12}$$

for all $R \in O(3)$. Hence, in the special case $p = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} w_{M,N}[X_0, RX; RK^{(M,N)}; 0] &= w_{M,N}[\underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}; 0] , \\ T[X_0, RX; 0] &= T[\underline{X}; 0] , \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

for all $R \in O(3)$. That is, the effective Hamiltonian (5.6) is *rotation and reflection symmetric* if $p = 0$.

The parameter $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$ will in the sequel frequently be omitted from the notation.

5.1. **A Banach space of generalized Wick kernels.**

We introduce the Banach space

$$\mathfrak{W}_{M,N} = \Big\{ w_{M,N} \Big| \|w_{M,N}\|_\sigma^\sharp < \infty \Big\} ,$$

of generalized Wick kernels of *degree* (M, N), with $M + N \geq 1$, endowed with the norm

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{M,N}\|_\sigma^\sharp &:= \sum_{a_0=0,1} \|\partial_{X_0}^{a_0} w_{M,N}\|_\sigma + \sum_{\substack{1\le|\underline{a}|\le 2\\ a_0=0}} \|\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} w_{M,N}\|_\sigma \\ &+ \sup_{k\in k^{(M,N)}} \Big\| |k|^\sigma \partial_{|k|} \big(|k|^{-\sigma} w_{M,N}\big) \Big\|_\sigma + \mathbf{1}_{|p|>0} \sum_{|\underline{a}|\le 1} \Big\| \partial_{|p|} \partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} w_{M,N} \Big\|_\sigma , \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

where

$$\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} := \partial_{X_0}^{a_0} \cdots \partial_{X_3}^{a_3} \;\; , \;\; \underline{a} \in \mathbb{N}_0^4 , \tag{5.15}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{M,N}\|_\sigma &:= \sup_{K^{(M,N)}\in(B_1\times\{+,-\})^{M+N}} (2\pi^{\frac{1}{2}})^{M+N} \big|k^{(M,N)}\big|^{-\sigma} \\ &\quad \times \sup_{|X|\le X_0<1} \big|w_{M,N}[\underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}]\big| . \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

Remark 5.1. *We note that* $\epsilon(k, \lambda)$ *is homogenous of degree zero with respect to* $|k|$, *whereby* $\epsilon(\,\cdot\,, \lambda) : S^2 \to S^2$. *The definition of the norm (5.14) only involves the* radial *derivative* $\partial_{|k|}$ *with respect to the photon momentum, but no tangent derivatives. Therefore, no regularity beyond measurability of the polarization vectors is required.*

Remark 5.2. *We will employ different methods in our analysis for the cases* $p = 0$ *and* $p \neq 0$. *For this reason, the derivative with respect to* $|p|$ *does not enter the definition of the norm (5.14) if* $p = 0$.

Remark 5.3. *We use the supremum norm in* $k^{(M,N)}$*-space instead of a weighted* L^2*-norm as in* [1], *because the soft photon sum rules in Section 6.5 require a pointwise property of* $w_{M,N}$ *with respect to* $k^{(M,N)}$. *Consequently, the norm of generalized Wick kernels (5.16) is stronger than that used in* [1] *(there also denoted by* $\| \cdot \|_\sigma$*), and the spaces* $\mathfrak{W}_{M,N}$ *are smaller than the corresponding spaces in* [1]. *Apart from this, there is no fundamental difference in comparison to* [1]. *Indeed, the following key theorem, which relates the operator norm on* $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_{red}]$ *to* $\| \cdot \|_\sigma$, *follows straightforwardly from the corresponding result proven as Theorem 3.1 in* [1].

Theorem 5.4. *Let* $\sigma > 0$, *and* $M, N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, *such that* $M + N \geq 1$. *Assume that* $w_{M,N} \in \mathfrak{W}_{M,N}$, *and* $W_{M,N} := W_{M,N}[w_{M,N}]$. *Then, on* $\mathcal{H}_{red}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|W_{M,N}\|_{\mathrm{op}} &\leq \|(H_f P_\Omega^\perp)^{-M/2} W_{M,N} (H_f P_\Omega^\perp)^{-N/2}\|_{\mathrm{op}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M^{\frac{M}{2}} N^{\frac{N}{2}}} \|w_{M,N}\|_\sigma \, , \end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

where $\| \cdot \|_{\mathrm{op}}$ *denotes the operator norm on* $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_{red}]$. $P_\Omega := \big|\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega\big|$ *is the orthoprojector onto the span of the vacuum vector in* $\mathcal{F}$, *and* $P_\Omega^\perp = \mathbf{1} - P_\Omega$ *is its complement.*

For $M = N = 0$, we consider the natural splitting

$$w_{0,0}[\underline{X}] = w_{0,0}[\underline{0}] + \big(w_{0,0}[\underline{X}] - w_{0,0}[\underline{0}]\big) \, ,$$

which induces the decomposition

$$\mathfrak{W}_{0,0} = \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathfrak{T}^\sharp \, ,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{T}^\sharp := \Big\{ T : \bigcup_{r \in [0,1)} \{r\} \times B_r \to \mathbb{C} \quad \Big| \quad & \|T\|_{\mathfrak{T}}^\sharp < \infty \, , \ T[\underline{0}; p] = 0 \, , \\ & T[X_0, RX; p] = T[\underline{X}; R^{-1} p] \ \ \forall \, R \in O(3) \Big\} \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\|T\|_{\mathfrak{T}}^\sharp := \sup \Big\{ \|P_{|X| \leq X_0 < 3/4} T\|^\sharp \, , \, \frac{1}{K_\Theta} \|P_{|X| \leq X_0 \in [3/4,1)} T\|^\sharp \Big\} \, , \tag{5.18}$$

using

$$\begin{aligned} \|T\|^\sharp := \sup_{|X| \leq X_0 < 1} |\partial_{X_0} T| \quad &+ \quad \sum_{\substack{|\underline{a}|=1,2 \\ a_0 = 0}} \sup_{|X| \leq X_0 < 1} \big|\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} T\big| \\ &+ \quad \sup_{|X| \leq X_0 < 1} \mathbf{1}_{|p|>0} \sum_{|\underline{a}| \leq 1} \big|\partial_{|p|} \partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} T\big| \, . \end{aligned} \tag{5.19}$$

The (explicitly computable) constant $1 < K_\Theta < \infty$ depends only on the smooth cutoff function Θ, which was introduced in (5.1), and is determined by the condition formulated in (9.10) below. The different weights in $\| \cdot \|_{\mathfrak{T}}^\sharp$ on the spectral subintervals $[0, \frac{3}{4})$ and $[\frac{3}{4}, 1)$ account for the overlap effects discussed in Section 4.5. Evidently, $(\mathfrak{T}^\sharp, \| \cdot \|_{\mathfrak{T}}^\sharp)$ is a Banach space, and $\| \cdot \|^\sharp$, $\| \cdot \|_{\mathfrak{T}}^\sharp$ are equivalent norms.

Correspondingly, we introduce the space of sequences of generalized Wick kernels

$$\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}^\sharp := \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathfrak{T}^\sharp \oplus \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 1}^\sharp \,, \tag{5.20}$$

where

$$\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq k}^\sharp := \bigoplus_{M+N \geq k} \mathfrak{W}_{M,N} \,. \tag{5.21}$$

Elements of this space are henceforth denoted by

$$\underline{w} \;\; = \;\; E \oplus T \oplus \underline{w}_1 \;\in\; \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}^\sharp \tag{5.22}$$

with

$$\underline{w}_k \;\; = \;\; (w_{M,N})_{M+N \geq k} \;\in\; \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq k}^\sharp \,. \tag{5.23}$$

Given $\xi \in (0, 1)$, we define the norm

$$\|\underline{w}\|_{\xi,\sigma}^\sharp := |E| + \|T\|_{\mathfrak{T}}^\sharp + \|\underline{w}_1\|_{\xi,\sigma}^\sharp \,, \tag{5.24}$$

where

$$\|\underline{w}_k\|_{\xi,\sigma}^\sharp := \sum_{M+N \geq k} \xi^{-M-N} \|w_{M,N}\|_\sigma^\sharp \,, \tag{5.25}$$

and note that for $A = 0, 1$, $(\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq A}^\sharp, \| \cdot \|_{\xi,\sigma})$ is a Banach space.

We will henceforth write

$$W[\underline{w}] := \sum_{M+N \geq 1} W_{M,N}[w_{M,N}] \,.$$

According to Theorem 3.3 in [1], the map

$$\begin{aligned} H : \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}^\sharp \;\; &\to \;\; \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{red}) \\ \underline{w} \;\; &\mapsto \;\; H[\underline{w}] := T[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + E \chi_1^2[H_f] + \chi_1[H_f] W[\underline{w}] \chi_1[H_f] \end{aligned} \tag{5.26}$$

is an injective embedding of $\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}^\sharp$ into the bounded operators on $\mathcal{H}_{red}$. In particular, we have an a-priori bound

$$\|H[\underline{w}]\| \leq \|\underline{w}\|_{\xi,\sigma}^\sharp \,, \tag{5.27}$$

for $\underline{w} \in \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}^\sharp$, and

$$\|H[\underline{w}_1]\| \leq \xi \|\underline{w}_1\|_{\xi,\sigma}^\sharp \tag{5.28}$$

for $\underline{w}_1 \in \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 1}^\sharp$.

6. ISOSPECTRAL RENORMALIZATON GROUP: RENORMALIZATION MAP

We will next construct a variant of the isospectral renormalization map presented in [1] that accommodates the specific features of the model considered in this paper.

6.1. **Definition of the isospectral renormalizaton map.** We let $\underline{w}$ depend holomorphically on a spectral parameter $z \in D_{\frac{1}{10}} := \{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \big| |\zeta| \leq \frac{1}{10}\}$, and consider families of effective Hamiltonians parametrized by $\underline{w}[z]$. Accordingly, we introduce the Banach space $\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0} = \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathfrak{T} \oplus \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 1}$ of analytic functions on the disc $D_{\frac{1}{10}}$, taking values in $\underline{\mathfrak{W}}^{\sharp}_{\geq 0}$, and endowed with the norm

$$\|\underline{w}\|_{\xi,\sigma} := \sup_{z \in D_{\frac{1}{10}}} \|\underline{w}[z]\|^{\sharp}_{\xi,\sigma} .$$

Furthermore, we denote the Banach space of analytic families $D_{\frac{1}{10}} \to H[\underline{\mathfrak{W}}^{\sharp}_{\geq 0}]$, $z \mapsto H[\underline{w}[z]]$, by $H[\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}]$.

For $\rho \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we introduce the renormalization transformation $\mathcal{R}_\rho$. Given $\underline{w} \in \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}$, it is defined by the composition of the following three operations:

- **(F)** The degrees of freedom in the range of photon field energies in $[\rho, 1]$ are eliminated (*decimated*) by use of the smooth Feshbach map $F_{\chi_\rho[H_f]}$, applied to the Feshbach pair $(H[\underline{w}], H_f)$. Here,

  $$\chi_\rho[H_f] := \sin[\frac{\pi}{2}\Theta(H_f/\rho)]$$

  is a smooth characteristic function on $[0, \rho)$, where Θ has been introduced in (5.1).
- **(S)** A unitary rescaling transformation S_ρ, under which $\mathbf{1}[H_f < \rho] \mapsto \mathbf{1}[H_f < 1]$, and $\chi_\rho[H_f] \mapsto \chi_1[H_f]$, followed by multiplication by $\frac{1}{\rho}$.
- **(E)** An analytic transformation E_ρ of the spectral parameter $z \in D_{\frac{1}{10}}$ in $\underline{w}[z]$.

6.1.1. *The operation* **(S)**. The rescaling transformation S_ρ on $\mathcal{F}$ is given by $S_\rho[\mathbf{1}] = \frac{1}{\rho}\mathbf{1}$ and

$$S_\rho[a^\sharp(K)] = \rho^{-\frac{5}{2}} a^\sharp(\rho^{-1}K) \tag{6.1}$$

where $\rho^{-1}K := (\rho^{-1}k, \lambda)$, and $K \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \{+, -\}$. (We note that the definition of S_ρ includes multiplication by $\frac{1}{\rho}$. Under unitary scaling, $a^\sharp(K)$ is mapped to $\rho^{-\frac{3}{2}} a^\sharp(\rho^{-1}K)$).

Restricted to $H[\mathfrak{W}^\sharp_{\geq 0}] \subset \mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_{red}]$, it induces a rescaling map s_ρ on $\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}$ by

$$S_\rho[H[\underline{w}]] =: H[s_\rho[\underline{w}]] =: H[(s_\rho[w_{M,N}])_{M+N \geq 0}] \, , \tag{6.2}$$

where

$$s_\rho[w_{M,N}][\underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}; p] = \rho^{M+N-1} w_{M,N}[\rho \underline{X}; \rho K^{(M,N)}; p] \, , \tag{6.3}$$

admitting the a priori bound

$$\|s_\rho[w_{M,N}]\|_\sigma \quad \leq \quad \rho^{(1+\sigma)(M+N)-1} \|w_{M,N}\|_\sigma \tag{6.4}$$

(note that the conserved momentum p is *not* rescaled). Thus, from application of S_ρ, $\|w_{M,N}\|_\sigma$ is contracted by a factor of at least ρ^σ for all M, N with $M + N \geq 1$.

6.1.2. *The operation* **(E)**. The renormalization of the spectral parameter is determined as follows. For a given $\underline{w} \in \mathfrak{W}_{\geq 0}$ with $E[z] := w_{0,0}[z; \underline{0}]$, we define

$$\mathcal{U}[\underline{w}] := \left\{ z \in D_{\frac{1}{10}} \,\middle|\, |E[z]| \leq \frac{\rho}{10} \right\} ,$$

and consider the analytic map

$$\begin{array}{rcl} E_\rho : \mathcal{U}[\underline{w}] & \rightarrow & D_{\frac{1}{10}} \\ z & \mapsto & \rho^{-1} E[z] \; . \end{array}$$

We note that E_ρ is a bijection, where $\mathcal{U}[\underline{w}]$ is close to the disc of radius ρ centered at 0, provided that $\underline{w}$ is close to a non-interacting theory (defined by $\underline{w}_0^{(p;\lambda)}$ in (6.12) below).

6.1.3. *The operation* **(F)**. For the decimation of degrees of freedom by the smooth Feshbach map, one must verify that given $\underline{w} \in \mathfrak{D}(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda)$, and $z \in \mathcal{U}[\underline{w}]$, $\big(H[\underline{w}[z]], H_f\big)$ is a Feshbach pair corresponding to $\chi_\rho[H_f]$. This is done in Proposition 6.2 below.

6.1.4. *The renormalization transformation.* Composing the rescaling transformation S_ρ, the analytic transformation of the spectral parameter E_ρ, and the smooth Feshbach map, we now define the *renormalization transformation* $\mathcal{R}_\rho$.

We note that by arguments presented in [1], the map $H : \underline{w} \mapsto H[\underline{w}]$ injectively embeds $\mathfrak{W}_{\geq 0}$ into the bounded operators on $\mathcal{H}_{red}$. The domain of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$, $\mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{R}_\rho)$, is defined by those elements $\underline{w} \in \mathfrak{W}_{\geq 0}$ for which

$$R^H_\rho \left[H[\underline{w}] \right][\zeta] \;\; := \;\; S_\rho \Big[F_{\chi_\rho[H_f]} \Big(H\big[\underline{w}[E_\rho^{-1}[\zeta]] \big] \, , \, H_f \Big) \Big] \tag{6.5}$$

is well-defined and in the domain of H^{-1}, where $\zeta \in D_{\frac{1}{10}}$. The map R^H_ρ is referred to as the *renormalization map acting on operators.*

Accordingly, we define the *renormalization map (acting on generalized Wick kernels)*

$$\mathcal{R}_\rho := H^{-1} \circ R^H_\rho \circ H \tag{6.6}$$

on $\mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{R}_\rho)$. We shall prove below that the intersection of the domain and range of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ contains a family of polydiscs.

6.2. **Choice of a free comparison theory.** An essential part of our analysis is based on the comparison of $\underline{w} \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{R}_\rho)$ to a family of *non*-interacting theories parametrized by $\underline{w}_0^{(p;\lambda)}[z] \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{R}_\rho)$, which converges to a fixed point of the renormalization transformation $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ in the limit $z, \lambda \to 0$. We shall here, as a first step, construct this family of free comparison theories, and discuss the structure of fixed points of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ that parametrize non-interacting theories.

As the free comparison kernel, we consider

$$\underline{w}_0^{(p;\lambda)}[z] = z \oplus T_0^{(p;\lambda)}[z; \underline{X}] \oplus \underline{0}_1 \; . \tag{6.7}$$

$\underline{w}_0^{(p;\lambda)}[z]$ is chosen in a manner that on the subspace $\mathrm{Ran}(\bar{P}_1^{\perp}) \subset \mathcal{H}_{red}$ (on which $\chi_1[H_f] \equiv 1$), the operator $T_0^{(p;\lambda)}[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}] = H[\underline{w}_0^{(p;\lambda)}]$ equals $H_f - |p|P_f^{\|} + \lambda P_f^2 + z$. The latter corresponds to the rescaled non-interacting part of the fiber Hamiltonian $H(p,\sigma)$. On the complementary subspace $\mathrm{Ran}(\bar{P}_1) \subset \mathcal{H}_{red}$, the operator $T_0^{(p;\lambda)}[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}]$ is more complicated due to overlap effects from $\chi_1[H_f]\bar{\chi}_1[H_f] \neq 0$, as we show below.

For the precise discussion, we first of all observe that

$$\Big(H_f - |p|P_f^{\|} + \lambda\rho^{-1}P_f^2 + z\rho\chi_1^2[H_f]\,,\, H_f\Big) \in \mathfrak{F}\mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{H}_{red}, \chi_\rho[H_f]) \tag{6.8}$$

is a Feshbach pair corresponding to $\chi_\rho[H_f]$.

We define $\underline{w}_0^{(p;\lambda)}[z]$ by

$$H[\underline{w}_0^{(p;\lambda)}[z]] = R_\rho^H\Big[H_f - |p|P_f^{\|} + \lambda\rho^{-1}P_f^2 + z\rho\chi_1^2[H_f]\Big]\,, \tag{6.9}$$

see (6.5), so that

$$\begin{aligned} H[\underline{w}_0^{(p;\lambda)}[z]] \;&=\; H_f + \chi_1^2[H_f]\big(z - |p|P_f^{\|} + \lambda P_f^2\big) \\ &\quad - \; \frac{\big(|p|P_f^{\|} - \lambda P_f^2\big)^2\chi_1^2[H_f]\bar{\chi}_1^2[H_f]}{H_f + \bar{\chi}_1^2[H_f]\big(z - |p|P_f^{\|} + \lambda P_f^2\big)}\Big|_{\mathrm{Ran}(\bar{\chi}_1[H_f])}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{6.10}$$

We observe that in the limit $z, \lambda \to 0$, the operator

$$\lim_{z\to 0}\lim_{\lambda\to 0} H[\underline{w}_0^{(p;\lambda)}[z]] = H_f - \chi_1^2[H_f]|p|P_f^{\|} - \frac{(|p|P_f^{\|})^2\chi_1^2[H_f]\bar{\chi}_1^2[H_f]}{H_f - \bar{\chi}_1^2[H_f]|p|P_f^{\|}}\Bigg|_{\mathrm{Ran}(\bar{\chi}_1[H_f])}$$

defines a *fixed point* of the renormalization transformation $\mathcal{R}_\rho$. Due to the non-linear nature of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$, and $\chi_1[H_f]\bar{\chi}_1[H_f] \neq 0$, it notably *differs* on the subspace $\mathrm{Ran}(\chi_1[H_f]) \cap \mathrm{Ran}(\bar{\chi}_1[H_f])$ from the operator $H_f - |p|P_f^{\|}$, which is a fixed point of the (linear) *rescaling* transformation S_ρ on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{red})$.

Let $P_{\mathfrak{T}}$ denote the projection

$$P_{\mathfrak{T}} : \left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0} & \to & \mathfrak{T} \\ \underline{w} = (E, T, \underline{w}_1) & \mapsto & T\,. \end{array} \right. \tag{6.11}$$

Then, the function $T_0^{(p;\lambda)}$ in (6.7) is given by

$$T_0^{(p;\lambda)}[z;\underline{X}] \;=\; P_{\mathfrak{T}}\mathcal{R}_\rho\Big[\big(\rho z\big) \oplus \big(X_0 - |p|X^{\|} + \lambda\rho^{-1}X^2\big) \oplus \underline{0}_1\Big]\,. \tag{6.12}$$

$T_0^{(p;\lambda)}$ is used for the definition of polydiscs in the next section.

6.3. **The domain of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$.** We shall next prove that the domain of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ contains a *polydisc* of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon,\delta,\lambda) := \Big\{ \underline{w} \in \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0} \Big| \sup_{z\in D_{\frac{1}{10}}} \|T[z;\,\cdot\,] - T_0^{(p;\lambda)}[z;\,\cdot\,]\|^\sharp_{\mathfrak{T}} &< \delta\,, \\ \sup_{z\in D_{\frac{1}{10}}} |E[z]-z| &< \epsilon\,, \\ \sup_{z\in D_{\frac{1}{10}}} |\partial_{|p|}E[z]| &< \epsilon\,, \\ \sup_{z\in D_{\frac{1}{10}}} \|\underline{w}_1[z]\|^\sharp_{\xi,\sigma} &< \epsilon \Big\}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

for $0 < |p| < \frac{1}{3}$, $\epsilon, \delta > 0$, and $0 \leq \lambda < \frac{1}{2}$. As noted above, the function $T_0^{(p;\lambda)}[z;\underline{X}]$, defined in (6.12), is chosen close to a fixed point of the renormalization transformation. One can verify along the lines demonstrated in [1] that

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\{\underline{w}\in\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}\Big| \|\underline{w}-\underline{w}_0^{(p;\lambda)}\|_{\xi,\sigma}\leq\epsilon\Big\} &\subseteq \mathfrak{D}(\epsilon,\delta,\lambda) \\ &\subseteq \Big\{\underline{w}\in\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}\Big| \|\underline{w}-\underline{w}_0^{(p;\lambda)}\|_{\xi,\sigma}\leq 2\delta+2\epsilon\Big\}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon,\delta,\lambda)$ is comparable to an (ϵ,δ)-ball about $\underline{w}_0^{(p;\lambda)}[z]$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $0<\xi<1$, $\sigma>0$ and $0<\rho\leq\frac{1}{2}$. Then,*

$$D_{\frac{\rho}{20}} \subseteq \mathcal{U}[\underline{w}] \subseteq D_{\frac{3\rho}{20}} \tag{6.14}$$

for all $\underline{w}\in\mathfrak{D}(\frac{\rho}{20},\frac{\rho}{20},\frac{1}{2})$, and

$$|\rho\partial_z E[z]-1|\leq 1\,, \tag{6.15}$$

for all $z\in\mathcal{U}[\underline{w}]$. Then, $E_\rho:\mathcal{U}[\underline{w}]\to D_{\frac{1}{10}}$ is a bijection, for all $\underline{w}\in\mathfrak{D}(\frac{\rho}{20},\frac{\rho}{20},\frac{1}{2})$.

This Lemma corresponds to Lemma 3.4 in [1], where we refer for the proof.

Proposition 6.2. *(Domain of the smooth Feshbach map) For any fixed choice of $0\leq|p|<\frac{1}{3}$, $0<\rho<\frac{1}{2}$, $\sigma>0$, and $0<\xi<1$, $(H[\underline{w}[z]],H_f)$ defines a Feshbach pair corresponding to $\chi_\rho[H_f]$, for all $\underline{w}\in\mathfrak{D}(\frac{\rho}{20},\frac{\rho}{20},\frac{1}{2})$ and all $z\in\mathcal{U}[\underline{w}]$.*

Proof. Since $H[\underline{w}[z]]$ and H_f define bounded operators on $\mathcal{H}_{red}$, it suffices to verify the invertibility of $T[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}]+E[z]$ on $\mathrm{Ran}(\bar\chi_1[H_f])$.

Besides $0\leq|p|<\frac{1}{3}$ and $0\leq\lambda\leq\frac{1}{2}$, we have $|E[z]|<\frac{\rho}{10}$. Using $|P_f|\leq H_f$, $\chi_1^2[H_f]\bar\chi_1^2[H_f]\leq\frac{1}{4}$, and $H_f\geq\frac{3}{4}$ on $\mathrm{Ran}(\bar\chi_1[H_f])$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}|T_0^{(p;\lambda)}[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}]| &\geq H_f(1-|p|)-\frac{H_f}{4}\frac{(|p|+\lambda)^2}{(1-|p|)-4|E[z]|/3} \\ &\geq \frac{H_f}{5}\,,\end{aligned} \tag{6.16}$$

respectively,

$$\inf_{|X|\leq X_0\leq 1}|T_0^{(p;\lambda)}[z;\underline{X}]|\geq\frac{X_0}{5}\,. \tag{6.17}$$

Thus, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\inf_{|X|\le X_0\le 1} |T[z;\underline{X}] - E[z]| \\
&\quad\ge \inf_{|X|\le X_0\le 1} \Big\{ |T_0^{(p;\lambda)}[z;\underline{X}]| - |T[z;\underline{X}] - T_0^{(p;\lambda)}[z;\underline{X}]| \Big\} - |E[z]| \\
&\quad\ge X_0 \Big(\frac{1}{5} - \|T[z;\underline{X}] - T_0^{(p;\lambda)}[z;\underline{X}]\|_{\mathfrak{T}} \Big) - \sup_{z\in\mathcal{U}[\underline{w}]} |E[z]| \\
&\quad\ge \frac{3\rho}{4}\Big(\frac{1}{3} - \frac{\rho}{10}\Big) - \frac{\rho}{10} > \frac{\rho}{100} \,. \qquad (6.18)
\end{aligned}$$

The claim follows. □

6.4. **Generalized Wick ordering.** The next step in the construction of $\widehat{\underline{w}} = \mathcal{R}_\rho[\underline{w}]$ consists of determining the *generalized Wick ordered* form of the right hand side of (6.5). To this end, we let

$$W[z] := \sum_{M+N\ge 1} W_{M,N}[w_{M,N}[z]] \,, \qquad (6.19)$$

and we observe that by Proposition 6.2 and Theorem 5.4,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f] \big| T[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + E[z] \big|\Big|_{\mathrm{Ran}(\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f])}^{-1} \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\|_{op} &\le \frac{100}{\rho} \,, \\
\|W[z]\|_{op} &\le \frac{\xi\rho}{10} \,, \qquad (6.20)
\end{aligned}$$

for $\underline{w} \in \mathfrak{D}(\frac{\rho}{20}, \frac{\rho}{20}, \frac{1}{2})$. We introduce the notation

$$\Upsilon_\rho[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}] := \Upsilon_{\chi_\rho[H_f]}\big(T[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + E[z]\chi_1^2[H_f] \,,\, H_f \big) \,, \qquad (6.21)$$

see (4.17), and write

$$\bar{R}_0[\underline{w}[z]] := \Big[H_f + (\bar{\chi}_\rho^2 \chi_1^2)[H_f] \big(\tilde{T}[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + E[z] \big) \Big]^{-1} \qquad (6.22)$$

for the free resolvent on $\mathrm{Ran}(\bar{\chi}_\rho)$, with

$$T[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}] = H_f + \chi_1^2[H_f]\tilde{T}[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}] \,. \qquad (6.23)$$

Then, Lemma 4.6 implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{\chi_\rho[H_f]}\big(H[\underline{w}[z]], H_f \big) &= E[z]\chi_\rho^2[H_f] + H_f + \tilde{T}[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}]\Upsilon_\rho[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}]\chi_\rho^2[H_f] \\
&\quad + \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{L-1} \chi_\rho[H_f] \Upsilon_\rho[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}] W[\underline{w}[z]] \\
&\qquad \times \Big[(\bar{\chi}_\rho^2\chi_1^2)[H_f] \bar{R}_0[\underline{w}[z]] W[\underline{w}[z]] \Big]^{L-1} \Upsilon_\rho[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}]\chi_\rho[H_f] \,, \qquad (6.24)
\end{aligned}$$

which is norm convergent due to (6.20).

Next, we introduce the operators

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{p,q}^{m,n}[\underline{w}|\underline{X}; K^{(m+p,n+q)}] &:= P_{red} \int_{B_1^{p+q}} \frac{dQ^{(p,q)}}{|Q^{p,q}|^{\frac{1}{2}}} a^*(Q^{(p)}) \\
&\qquad \times w_{m+p,n+q}[\underline{\mathcal{P}} + \underline{X}; Q^{(p)}, K^{(m)}; \tilde{Q}^{(q)}, \tilde{K}^{(n)}] a(\tilde{Q}^{(q)}) P_{red} \,. \qquad (6.25)
\end{aligned}$$

The (generalized) Wick ordering of the resolvent expansion (6.24) is governed by the following theorem.

Theorem 6.3. *Let* $\underline{w} = (w_{M,N})_{M+N\geq 1} \in \underline{\mathfrak{W}}^\sharp_{\geq 1}$. *Writing* $W_{M,N} := W_{M,N}[w_{M,N}]$, $W = \sum_{M+N\geq 1} W_{M,N}$, *and* $F_0, \dots, F_L \in \mathfrak{W}_{0,0}$, *let* S_M *denote the* M*-th symmetric group. Then,*

$$F_0 W F_1 W \cdots W F_{L-1} W F_L = H[\underline{\tilde{w}}] \, ,$$

where $\underline{\tilde{w}} \in (\widehat{w}^{(sym)}_{M,N})_{M+N\geq 0} \in \underline{\mathfrak{W}}^\sharp_{\geq 0}$ *is determined by the symmetrization with respect to* $K^{(M)}$ *and* $\tilde{K}^{(N)}$,

$$\tilde{w}^{(sym)}_{M,N}[\underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}] = \frac{1}{M!N!} \sum_{\pi\in S_M} \sum_{\tilde{\pi}\in S_N} \tilde{w}_{M,N}[\underline{X}; K_{\pi(1)}, \dots, K_{\pi(M)}; \tilde{K}_{\tilde{\pi}(1)}, \dots, \tilde{K}_{\tilde{\pi}(N)}] \, ,$$

of

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{w}_{M,N}[\underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}] \quad &= \quad \sum_{\substack{m_1+\cdots+m_L=M \\ n_1+\cdots+n_L=N}} \; \sum_{\substack{p_1,q_1,\dots,p_L,q_L \\ m_\ell+p_\ell+n_\ell+q_\ell\geq 1}} \\ &\times \quad \Big[\prod_{\ell=1}^{L} \begin{pmatrix} m_\ell + p_\ell \\ p_\ell \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} n_\ell + q_\ell \\ q_\ell \end{pmatrix}\Big] F_0[\underline{X} + \underline{\tilde{X}}_0] \, F_L[\underline{X} + \underline{\tilde{X}}_L] \\ &\times \quad \Big\langle \Omega \, , \, \tilde{W}[\underline{X} + \underline{X}_1; K_1^{(m_1,n_1)}] F_1[\underline{\mathcal{P}} + \underline{X} + \underline{\tilde{X}}_1; K_2^{(m_2,n_2)}] \\ &\qquad \cdots F_{L-1}[\underline{\mathcal{P}} + \underline{X} + \underline{\tilde{X}}_{L-1}] \tilde{W}[\underline{X} + \underline{X}_L; K_L^{(m_l,n_L)}] \, \Omega \Big\rangle \end{aligned}$$

with the definitions

$$\tilde{W}_\ell[\underline{X} + \underline{X}_\ell; K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \quad := \quad W^{m_\ell,n_\ell}_{p_\ell,q_\ell}[\underline{w} \big| \underline{X} + \underline{X}_\ell; K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \, , \tag{6.26}$$

$$K^{(M,N)} = (K^{(m_1,n_1)}, \dots, K^{(m_L,n_L)}) \quad , \quad K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)} := (K_\ell^{(m_\ell)}, \tilde{K}_\ell^{(n_\ell)}) \, ,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{X}_\ell \quad &:= \quad \sum [\underline{\tilde{k}}_1^{(n_1)}] + \cdots + \sum [\underline{\tilde{k}}_{\ell-1}^{(n_{\ell-1})}] + \sum [\underline{k}_{\ell+1}^{(m_{\ell+1})}] + \cdots + \sum [\underline{k}_L^{(m_L)}] \\ \underline{\tilde{X}}_\ell \quad &:= \quad \sum [\underline{\tilde{k}}_1^{(n_1)}] + \cdots + \sum [\underline{\tilde{k}}_\ell^{(n_\ell)}] + \sum [\underline{k}_{\ell+1}^{(m_{\ell+1})}] + \cdots + \sum [\underline{k}_L^{(m_L)}] \, . \end{aligned}$$

Applying the rescaling transformation, and transforming the spectral parameter, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} H[\underline{\widehat{w}}[\zeta]] \quad &= \quad \mathcal{R}^H_\rho[H[\underline{w}][E_\rho^{-1}[\zeta]]] \\ &= \quad S_\rho(F_{\chi_\rho}[H_f](H[\underline{w}][E_\rho^{-1}[\zeta]], H_f)) \, , \end{aligned} \tag{6.27}$$

(see (6.5)). $\underline{\widehat{w}}[\zeta]$ is characterized in the following theorem.

Theorem 6.4. *Let* $\zeta \in D_{\frac{1}{10}}$*, and* $z := E_\rho^{-1}[\zeta] \in \mathcal{U}[\underline{w}]$*. (6.27) determines* $\underline{\widehat{w}} = (\underline{\widehat{w}}_{M,N}^{(sym)})_{M+N\geq 0}$ *as the symmetrization with respect to* $K^{(M)}$ *and* $\tilde{K}^{(N)}$ *of*

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{w}_{M,N}[\zeta;\underline{X};K^{(M,N)}] \;&=\; \rho^{M+N-1}\sum_{L=1}^{\infty}(-1)^{L-1} \\
&\times \sum_{\substack{m_1+\cdots+m_L=M \\ n_1+\cdots n_L=N}} \;\sum_{\substack{p_1,q_1,\dots,p_L,q_L: \\ m_\ell+p_\ell+n_\ell+q_\ell\geq 1}} \Big[\prod_{\ell=1}^{L}\Big(\begin{array}{c} m_\ell+p_\ell \\ p_\ell \end{array}\Big)\Big(\begin{array}{c} n_\ell+q_\ell \\ q_\ell \end{array}\Big)\Big] \\
&\times \Big\langle \Omega\,,\, \Upsilon_\rho[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}+\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{\tilde{X}}_0)]\tilde{W}_1[z;\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_1);\rho K_1^{(m_1,n_1)}] \\
&\qquad (\bar{\chi}_\rho^2\chi_1^2\bar{R}_0)[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}+\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{\tilde{X}}_1)]\tilde{W}_2[z;\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_2);\rho K_2^{(m_2,n_2)}] \\
&\qquad (\bar{\chi}_\rho^2\chi_1^2\bar{R}_0)[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}+\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{\tilde{X}}_2)]\cdots\cdots \\
&\qquad\qquad \cdots\cdots(\bar{\chi}_\rho^2\chi_1^2\bar{R}_0)[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}+\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{\tilde{X}}_{L-1})] \\
&\qquad \tilde{W}_L[z;\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_L);\rho K_L^{(m_L,n_L)}]\Upsilon_\rho[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}+\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{\tilde{X}}_L)]\,\Omega\Big\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{6.28}$$

in the case of $M+N\geq 1$*, and*

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{w}_{0,0} \;&=\; \mathcal{R}_\rho[-E[\,\cdot\,]\oplus w_{0,0}\oplus\underline{0}_1] \\
&+\; \rho^{-1}\sum_{L=2}^{\infty}(-1)^{L-1}\sum_{p_1+q_1\geq 1}\cdots\sum_{p_L+q_L\geq 1}\Upsilon_\rho^2[z;\underline{X}] \\
&\times \Big\langle \Omega\,,\, \tilde{W}_{p_1,q_1}[\underline{w}[z]\big|\rho\underline{X}](\bar{\chi}_\rho^2\chi_1^2\bar{R}_0)[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}+\rho\underline{X}]\tilde{W}_{p_2,q_2}[\underline{w}[z]\big|\rho\underline{X}] \\
&\qquad\qquad \cdots(\bar{\chi}_\rho^2\chi_1^2\bar{R}_0)[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}+\rho\underline{X}]\tilde{W}_{p_L,q_L}[\underline{w}[z]\big|\rho\underline{X}]\,\Omega\Big\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{6.29}$$

It remains to verify that $\underline{\widehat{w}}$ is again an element of $\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}$. We will in fact establish a much stronger result, and prove that $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ is contractive on a codimension-2 subspace of $\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}$. One of the key tools in this analysis are soft photon sum rules, which we address next.

6.5. **Soft photon sum rules.**

It is an important and deep property of the model analyzed in this work that the generalized Wick kernels $w_{M,N}$ generated by repeated applications of the renormalization map are, for different values of M, N, all mutually linked. We shall here prove the existence of a hierarchy of non-perturbative identities, which we refer to as the *soft photon sum rules*, that interrelate all $w_{M,N}$ in the small photon momentum regime.

The key point is that the soft photon sum rules are *preserved by the renormalization map*. The soft photon sum rules are in the present analysis used to prove that for the value $p = 0$ of the conserved total momentum, all interaction operators of the effective Hamiltonians are irrelevant even if the infrared regularization is removed, that is, when $\sigma \to 0$.

Definition 6.5. *Let* g *denote the electron charge, cf. (1.19). Given* $n \in \mathbb{R}^3$*,* $|n| = 1$*, let* $\epsilon(n,\lambda)$ *denote the photon polarization vector orthonormal to* n *labeled by the polarization index* λ*. Let* $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+$*.*

The sequence of generalized Wick kernels $\underline{w} \in \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}$ *is said to satisfy the*

soft photon sum rules $\mathbf{SR}[\mu]$

if the identity

$$\begin{aligned} g\mu\big\langle \epsilon(n,\lambda), \partial_X \big\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} \, w_{M,N}[\underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}] & \\ &= (M+1) \lim_{x\to 0} x^{-\sigma} w_{M+1,N}[\underline{X}; K^{(M+1,N)}]\Big|_{K_{M+1}=(xn,\lambda)} \\ &= (N+1) \lim_{x\to 0} x^{-\sigma} w_{M,N+1}[\underline{X}; K^{(M,N+1)}]\Big|_{\tilde{K}_{N+1}=(xn,\lambda)} \end{aligned} \tag{6.30}$$

is satisfied for all $M, N \geq 0$, and every choice of the unit vector n (we recall that X is the spectral variable corresponding to the photon momentum operator P_f).

Applying (6.30) inductively, beginning with $M, N = 0$, in the order indicated by

$$\begin{tikzcd}[row sep=small]
 & & & & \cdots \\
 & & & w_{3,0} \arrow[ur] \arrow[dr] & \\
 & & w_{2,0} \arrow[ur] \arrow[dr] & & \cdots \\
 & w_{1,0} \arrow[ur] \arrow[dr] & & w_{2,1} \arrow[ur] \arrow[dr] & \\
w_{0,0} \arrow[ur] \arrow[dr] & & w_{1,1} \arrow[ur] \arrow[dr] & & \cdots \\
 & w_{0,1} \arrow[ur] \arrow[dr] & & w_{1,2} \arrow[ur] \arrow[dr] & \\
 & & w_{0,2} \arrow[ur] \arrow[dr] & & \cdots \\
 & & & w_{0,3} \arrow[ur] \arrow[dr] & \\
 & & & & \cdots
\end{tikzcd} \tag{6.31}$$

all generalized Wick kernels are recursively linked to one another in the vicinity of the origin in photon momentum space.

As remarked in Section 3, these identities are due to $U(1)$ gauge invariance in the special case of non-relativistic quantum electrodynamics. But since in general, the existence of soft boson sum rules is independent from gauge invariance, such as the Gross transformed, translation-invariant 1-particle Nelson model described in Section 3.11 shows, we shall here prefer the notion of soft photon sum rules instead of Ward-Takahashi identities (which would be equally appropriate in non-relativistic quantum electrodynamics).

It is interesting to ask whether one can avoid the use of soft photon sum rules, and achieve this result by a more insightful use of $O(3)$-invariance in the case $p = 0$. It may appear surprising that rotational and reflection symmetry alone do in fact *not* suffice to prove irrelevance of the interaction, even if $p = 0$. There exist simple rotationally invariant models for which the interaction operators of the bare Hamiltonian (corresponding to the fiber Hamiltonian $H(p = 0, \sigma)$ in our case) scale naively like irrelevant operators, but which are in fact *marginal.* This is an artifact of the non-linear nature of the renormalization map. $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ can generate marginal operators from irrelevant operators, unless this is suppressed by symmetries of the model beyond rotation and reflection invariance.

6.6. **Codimension two contractivity of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ on a polydisc.** A quintessential property of the renormalization map $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ is that it is contractive on a codimension 2 subspace of a polydisc of the form (6.13) (after projecting out the relevant direction corresponding to E in $\underline{w} = (E, T, \underline{w}_1)$, cf. our introductory remarks in Section 3.4).

Let

$$\mathfrak{D}^{(\mu)}(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda) := \Big\{ \underline{w} \in \mathfrak{D}(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda) \Big| \underline{w} \text{ satisfies the soft photon sum rules } \mathbf{SR}[\mu] \Big\}$$

denote the subset of the polydisc $\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda)$ of generalized Wick kernels in the Banach space $(\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}, \| \cdot \|_{\sigma,\xi})$, for given ξ, which *satisfy the soft photon sum rules.* The definitions were given in (6.13) and (6.30). We shall prove that $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ is a *contraction* on a codimension 2 subspace of $\mathfrak{D}^{(\mu)}(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda)$.

Theorem 6.6. *The renormalization map $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ is codimension-2 contractive on the polydisc $\mathfrak{D}^{(\mu)}(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda)$ in the following sense.*

- *A. The case $0 < |p| < \frac{1}{3}$: For $\sigma > 0$, there exist constants $\rho = \rho(\sigma)$, ξ, $\epsilon_0(\sigma)$, such that for all $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0(\sigma)$ and $0 \leq \delta \leq \epsilon_0(\sigma)$,*

$$\mathcal{R}_\rho : \mathfrak{D}^{(\mu)}(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda) \to \mathfrak{D}^{(\rho^\sigma \mu)}(\frac{\epsilon}{2}, \delta + \epsilon, \rho\lambda) \; . \tag{6.32}$$

- *B. The case $|p| = 0$: For $\sigma \geq 0$, there are constants ρ, ξ, ϵ_0, all independent of σ, and a constant c independent of ρ, ϵ_0 and σ such that for arbitrary $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ and $0 \leq \delta \leq \epsilon_0$,*

$$\mathcal{R}_\rho : \mathfrak{D}^{(\mu)}(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda) \to \mathfrak{D}^{(\rho^\sigma \mu)}(c_4 \rho \epsilon, \delta + \epsilon, \rho\lambda) \; , \tag{6.33}$$

  where the constant c_4 is defined in (10.18) below. The renormalization map is therefore contractive on a codimension 2 subspace of $\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda)$, even without infrared regularization.

7. PROOF OF THEOREM 6.6: GENERALIZED WICK ORDERING

We introduce the following notation. For fixed $L \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\underline{m, p, n, q} := (m_1, p_1, n_1, q_1, \ldots, m_L, p_L, n_L, q_L) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{4L} \tag{7.1}$$

and

$$M := m_1 + \cdots + m_L \;\; , \;\; N := n_1 + \cdots + n_L \; . \tag{7.2}$$

We let

$$\begin{aligned} &V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w} \,|\, \underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}] \\ &\qquad := \Big\langle \Omega \, , \, F_0[\underline{X}] \prod_{\ell=1}^{L} \Big\{ \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho(\underline{X} + \underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell, n_\ell)}] F_\ell[\underline{X}] \Big\} \Omega \Big\rangle \; , \end{aligned} \tag{7.3}$$

where

$$F_0[\underline{X}] := \Upsilon_\rho[z; \underline{\mathcal{P}} + \rho(\underline{X} + \underline{\tilde{X}}_0)] \;\; , \;\; F_L[\underline{X}] := \Upsilon_\rho[z; \underline{\mathcal{P}} + \rho(\underline{X} + \underline{\tilde{X}}_L)] \tag{7.4}$$

(see (6.21)) and

$$F_\ell[\underline{X}] := \frac{(\bar{\chi}_\rho^2 \chi_1^2)[H_f + \rho(X_0 + \tilde{X}_{\ell,0})]}{H_f + \rho(X_0 + \tilde{X}_{\ell,0}) + (\bar{\chi}_\rho^2 \chi_1^2)[H_f + \rho(X_0 + \tilde{X}_{\ell,0})]\big(\tilde{T}[z; \underline{\mathcal{P}} + \rho(\underline{X} + \underline{\tilde{X}}_\ell)] + E[z]\big)} \tag{7.5}$$

for $\ell = 1, \ldots, L-1$, with $T[z; \underline{X}] = X_0 + \chi_1^2[X_0] T'[z; \underline{X}]$. We note that the definition of the operators $F_\ell[\underline{X}]$ in [1] contains a misprint.

Then,

$$\widehat{w}_{M,N}[\zeta; \underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}] = \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{L-1} \rho^{M+N-1} \sum_{\substack{m_1 + \cdots + m_L = M \\ n_1 + \cdots + n_L = N}} \tag{7.6}$$

$$\sum_{\substack{p_1, q_1, \ldots, p_L, q_L : \\ m_\ell + p_\ell + n_\ell + q_\ell \geq 1}} \Big[\prod_{\ell=1}^{L} \binom{m_\ell + p_\ell}{p_\ell} \binom{n_\ell + q_\ell}{q_\ell} \Big] V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w} \,|\, \underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}] \,,$$

where the scaling factors ρ^{M+N-1} were explained in connection with (6.3).

Lemma 7.1. *For $L \geq 1$ fixed, and $\underline{m,p,n,q} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{4L}$, one has $V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}} \in \mathfrak{W}^\sharp_{M,N}$. In particular,*

$$\rho^{M+N-1} \max\Big\{ \|\partial_{X_0} V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}\|_\sigma \,,\ \| |k|^\sigma \partial_{|k|} \big(|k|^{-\sigma} V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}} \big) \|_\sigma \Big\}$$

$$\leq 2(L+1) C_\Theta^{L+1} \rho^{(1+\sigma)(M+N)-L} \prod_{l=1}^{L} \frac{\|w_{m_l+p_l, n_l+q_l}[z]\|^\sharp_\sigma}{p_l^{p_l/2} q_l^{q_l/2}} \,, \tag{7.7}$$

for $\underline{X} = (X_0, X)$ and any $k \in k^{(M,N)}$. Furthermore,

$$\rho^{M+N-1} \|\partial^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{X}} V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}\|_\sigma$$

$$\leq 10(L+1)^2 C_\Theta^{L+2} \rho^{(1+\sigma)(M+N)-L} \prod_{l=1}^{L} \frac{\|w_{m_l+p_l, n_l+q_l}[z]\|^\sharp_\sigma}{p_l^{p_l/2} q_l^{q_l/2}} \,, \tag{7.8}$$

for $0 \leq |\underline{a}| \leq 2$, $a_0 = 0$. For $|p| > 0$, and $|\underline{a}| \leq 1$,

$$\rho^{M+N-1} \|\partial_{|p|} \partial^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{X}} V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}\|_\sigma$$

$$\leq 10(L+1)^2 C_\Theta^{L+2} \rho^{(1+\sigma)(M+N)-L} \prod_{l=1}^{L} \frac{\|w_{m_l+p_l, n_l+q_l}[z]\|^\sharp_\sigma}{p_l^{p_l/2} q_l^{q_l/2}} \,. \tag{7.9}$$

Consequently,

$$\rho^{M+N-1} \|V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}\|^\sharp_\sigma$$

$$\leq 10(L+1)^2 C_\Theta^{L+2} \rho^{(1+\sigma)(M+N)-L} \prod_{l=1}^{L} \frac{\|w_{m_l+p_l, n_l+q_l}[z]\|^\sharp_\sigma}{p_l^{p_l/2} q_l^{q_l/2}} \,, \tag{7.10}$$

using the convention $p^p = 1$ for $p = 0$. The constant C_Θ only depends on the choice of the smooth cutoff function χ_ρ.

7.1. **Proof of Lemma 7.1.** There exists a constant $1 \le C_\Theta < \infty$ that only depends on the choice of the smooth cutoff function Θ, such that

$$\|\partial_{X_0} F_\ell[\underline{X}]\|_{op} + \sum_{\substack{0\le|\underline{a}|\le 2\\ a_0=0}} \|\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} F_\ell[\underline{X}]\|_{op} + \sum_{|\underline{a}|\le 1} \|\partial_{|p|}\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} F_\ell[\underline{X}]\|_{op} \le \frac{C_\Theta}{\rho^{\eta(\ell)}} \, , \tag{7.11}$$

uniformly in $z \in D_{\frac{1}{10}}$, where

$$\eta(\ell) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \ell = 0, L \\ 1 & \text{if } \ell = 1, \dots, L-1 \, , \end{cases} \tag{7.12}$$

cf. (7.4) and (7.5). Here and in the sequel, $\| \cdot \|_{op}$ denotes the operator norm on $\mathcal{H}_{red} = \mathbf{1}[H_f < 1]\mathcal{F}$.

Let us to begin with consider (7.8), for the case $\underline{a} = \underline{0}$, where we have

$$\begin{aligned} |V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w} \,|\, \underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}]| \;\; &\le \;\; \prod_{\ell=0}^{L} \|F_\ell[\underline{X}_\ell]\|_{op} \\ & \qquad \times \prod_{\ell=1}^{L} \|\tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho(\underline{X} + \underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}]\|_{op} \\ &\le \;\; C_\Theta^{L+1} \rho^{-L+1} \prod_{\ell=1}^{L} \|\tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho(\underline{X} + \underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}]\|_{op} \, . \end{aligned} \tag{7.13}$$

$\| \cdot \|_{op}$ denotes the operator norm on $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_{red}]$.

Next, we discuss the various terms corresponding to $1 \le |\underline{a}| \le 2$.

7.1.1. *The case* $|\underline{a}| = 1$. We have

$$\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w} \,|\, \underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}] \; = \; V^{(L,i)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w} \,|\, \underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}] + V^{(L,ii)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w} \,|\, \underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}] \, ,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & V^{(L,i)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w} \,|\, \underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}] \\ & \qquad := \sum_{j=0}^{L} \Big\langle \Omega \, , \, \Big[\prod_{\ell=1}^{j-1} F_{\ell-1}[\underline{X}] \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho(\underline{X} + \underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \Big] \\ & \qquad \quad \times \Big(\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} F_j[\underline{X}] \Big) \Big[\prod_{\ell=j+1}^{L} \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho(\underline{X} + \underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] F_\ell[\underline{X}] \Big] \Omega \Big\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{7.14}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & V^{(L,ii)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w} \,|\, \underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}] \\ & \qquad := \sum_{j=1}^{L} \Big\langle \Omega \, , \, F_0[\underline{X}] \Big[\prod_{\ell=1}^{j-1} \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho(\underline{X} + \underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] F_\ell[\underline{X}] \Big] \\ & \qquad \quad \times \rho \Big(\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} \tilde{W}_j[z; \rho(\underline{X} + \underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_j^{(m_j,n_j)}] \Big) \\ & \qquad \quad \times \Big[\prod_{\ell=j+1}^{L} F_\ell[\underline{X}] \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho(\underline{X} + \underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \Big] F_L[\underline{X}] \, \Omega \Big\rangle \, . \end{aligned} \tag{7.15}$$

It follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|V^{(L,i)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w}\,|\,\underline{X};K^{(M,N)}]| \\
&\qquad \leq \sum_{j=0}^{L} \|\partial^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{X}} F_j\|_{op} \Big[\prod_{\substack{\ell=0\\ \ell\neq j}}^{L} \|F_\ell[\underline{X}]\|_{op} \Big] \\
&\qquad \times \prod_{\ell=1}^{L} \|\tilde{W}_\ell[\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell);\rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}]\|_{op} \\
&\qquad \leq (L+1) C_\Theta^{L+1} \rho^{-L+1} \prod_{\ell=1}^{L} \|\tilde{W}_\ell[z;\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell);\rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}]\|_{op}
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.16}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|V^{(L,ii)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w}\,|\,\underline{X};K^{(M,N)}]| \\
&\qquad \leq \Big[\prod_{\ell=0}^{L} \|F_\ell[\underline{X}]\|_{op} \Big] \Big\{ \sum_{j=1}^{L} \|\partial^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{X}} \tilde{W}_j[z;\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_j);\rho K_j^{(m_j,n_j)}]\|_{op} \\
&\qquad \times \prod_{\substack{\ell=1\\ \ell\neq j}}^{L} \|\tilde{W}_\ell[z;\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_j);\rho K_j^{(m_j,n_j)}]\|_{op} \Big\} \\
&\qquad \leq L C_\Theta^{L+1} \rho^{-L+2} \Big\{ \sum_{j=1}^{L} \|W^{m_j,n_j}_{p_j,q_j}\Big[\partial^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{X}} \underline{w}[z] \Big| \rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_j);\rho K_j^{(m_j,n_j)}\Big]\|_{op} \\
&\qquad \times \prod_{\substack{\ell=1\\ \ell\neq j}}^{L} \|\tilde{W}_\ell[z;\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell);\rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}]\|_{op} \Big\} \,.
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.17}
$$

7.1.2. *The case* $|\underline{a}| = 2$ *and* $a_0 = 0$. Due to $a_0 = 0$, no derivatives with respect to X_0 (the spectral variable corresponding to the operator H_f) appear here. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\partial^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{X}} V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w}\,|\,\underline{X};K^{(M,N)}] &= V^{(L,iii)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{X};K^{(M,N)}] \\
&+ \cdots\cdots + V^{(L,viii)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{X};K^{(M,N)}] \,,
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.18}
$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} V^{(L,iii)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w} \,|\, \underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}] \ :=& \sum_{\underline{a}_1+\underline{a}_2=\underline{a}} \ \sum_{j_2>j_1=0}^{L} \\ & \Big\langle \Omega \,, \, \Big[\prod_{\ell=1}^{j_1-1} F_{\ell-1}[\underline{X}] \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \Big] \\ & \times \Big(\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}_1} F_{j_1}[\underline{X}] \Big) \Big[\prod_{\ell=j_1}^{j_2-1} \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] F_{\ell-1}[\underline{X}] \Big] \\ & \times \tilde{W}_{j_2-1}[z; \rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_{j_2-1}^{(m_{j_2-1},n_{j_2-1})}] \Big(\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}_2} F_{j_2}[\underline{X}] \Big) \\ & \times \Big[\prod_{\ell=j_2+1}^{L} \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] F_\ell[\underline{X}] \Big] \Omega \Big\rangle \,, \end{aligned} \tag{7.19}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} V^{(L,iv)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w} \,|\, \underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}] \ :=& \sum_{\underline{a}_1+\underline{a}_2=\underline{a}} \ \sum_{j_2>j_1=0}^{L} \\ & \Big\langle \Omega \,, \, \Big[\prod_{\ell=1}^{j_1} F_{\ell-1}[\underline{X}] \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \Big] \\ & \times \Big(\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}_1} F_{j_1}[\underline{X}] \Big) \Big[\prod_{\ell=j_1+1}^{j_2-1} \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] F_\ell[\underline{X}] \Big] \\ & \times \rho \Big(\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}_2} \tilde{W}_{j_2}[z; \rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_{j_2}^{(m_{j_2},n_{j_2})}] \Big) \\ & \times \Big[\prod_{\ell=j_2+1}^{L} F_{\ell-1}[\underline{X}] \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \Big] F_L[\underline{X}] \, \Omega \Big\rangle \,. \end{aligned} \tag{7.20}$$

$V^{(L,v)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}$ is defined similarly as $V^{(L,iv)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}$, but applies to the case $j_2 < j_1$.

$$\begin{aligned} V^{(L,v)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w} \,|\, \underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}] \ :=& \sum_{\underline{a}_1+\underline{a}_2=\underline{a}} \ \sum_{j_2>j_1=0}^{L} \\ & \Big\langle \Omega \,, \, F_0[\underline{X}] \Big[\prod_{\ell=1}^{j_1-1} \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] F_\ell[\underline{X}] \Big] \\ & \times \rho \Big(\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}_1} \tilde{W}_{j_1}[z; \rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_{j_1}^{(m_{j_1},n_{j_1})}] \Big) \\ & \times F_{j_1}[\underline{X}] \Big[\prod_{\ell=j_1+1}^{j_2-1} \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] F_\ell[\underline{X}] \Big] \\ & \times \rho \Big(\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}_2} \tilde{W}_{j_2}[z; \rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_{j_2}^{(m_{j_2},n_{j_2})}] \Big) \\ & \times \Big[\prod_{\ell=j_2+1}^{L} F_\ell[\underline{X}] \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \Big] F_L[\underline{X}] \, \Omega \Big\rangle \,. \end{aligned} \tag{7.21}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} V^{(L,vii)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w}\,|\,\underline{X};K^{(M,N)}] \;:=\; & \sum_{j=0}^{L}\Big\langle\,\Omega\,,\,\Big[\prod_{\ell=1}^{j-1}F_{\ell-1}[\underline{X}]\tilde{W}_\ell[z;\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell);\rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}]\Big] \\ & \times\Big(\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}}F_j[\underline{X}]\Big)\Big[\prod_{\ell=j+1}^{L}\tilde{W}_\ell[z;\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell);\rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}]F_\ell[\underline{X}]\Big]\,\Omega\,\Big\rangle \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} V^{(L,viii)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w}\,|\,\underline{X};K^{(M,N)}] := \; & \sum_{j=0}^{L}\Big\langle\,\Omega\,,\,F_0[\underline{X}] \\ & \times\Big[\prod_{\ell=1}^{j-1}\tilde{W}_\ell[z;\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell);\rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}]F_\ell[\underline{X}]\Big] \\ & \times\rho^2\Big(\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}}\tilde{W}_j[z;\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell);\rho K_j^{(m_j,n_j)}]\Big) \\ & \times\Big[\prod_{\ell=j+1}^{L}F_{\ell-1}[\underline{X}]\tilde{W}_\ell[z;\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell);\rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}]\Big]F_L[\underline{X}]\,\Omega\,\Big\rangle\,. \end{aligned} \tag{7.22}$$

We then conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} |V^{(L,iii)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w}\,|\,\underline{X};K^{(M,N)}]| \;\le\; & \sum_{\underline{a}_1+\underline{a}_2=\underline{a}}\;\sum_{j_2>j_1=0}^{L}\|\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}_1}F_{j_1}\|_{op}\|\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}_2}F_{j_2}\|_{op} \\ & \times\prod_{\substack{\ell=0\\ \ell\neq j_1,j_2}}^{L}\|F_\ell[\underline{X}]\|_{op}\prod_{\ell=1}^{L}\|\tilde{W}_\ell[\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell);\rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}]\|_{op} \\ \le\; & L(L+1)C_\Theta^{L+1}\rho^{-L+1}\prod_{\ell=1}^{L}\|\tilde{W}_\ell[z;\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell);\rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}]\|_{op}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{7.23}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |V^{(L,iv)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w}\,|\,\underline{X};K^{(M,N)}]|\,,\;|V^{(L,v)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{X};K^{(M,N)}]| \;\le\; & \sum_{\underline{a}_1+\underline{a}_2=\underline{a}}\rho^{|\underline{a}_2|}\sum_{j_2>j_1=0}^{L} \\ & \times\|\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}_1}F_{j_1}\|_{op}\|W_{p_{j_2},q_{j_2}}^{(m_{j_2},n_{j_2})}\Big[\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}_2}\underline{w}[z]\Big|\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_{j_2});\rho K_{j_2}^{(m_{j_2},n_{j_2})}\Big]\|_{op} \\ & \times\Big[\prod_{\substack{\ell=0\\ \ell\neq j_1}}^{L}\|F_\ell[\underline{X}]\|_{op}\Big]\prod_{\substack{\ell=0\\ \ell\neq j_2}}^{L}\|\tilde{W}_\ell[\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell);\rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}]\|_{op} \\ \le\; & L(L+1)C_\Theta^{L+1}\rho^{-L+1}\prod_{\ell=1}^{L}\|\tilde{W}_\ell[z;\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell);\rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}]\|_{op}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{7.24}$$

Similarly,

$$
\begin{aligned}
|V^{(L,vi)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w}\,|\,\underline{X};K^{(M,N)}]| \;\leq\; & C_\Theta^{L+1}\rho^{-L+2} \sum_{\underline{a}_1+\underline{a}_2=\underline{a}} \\
& \times \Big\{ \sum_{j_2>j_1=1}^{L} \|W^{(m_{j_1},n_{j_1})}_{p_{j_1},q_{j_1}}\Big[\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}_1}\underline{w}[z]\Big|\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_{j_1});\rho K^{(m_{j_1},n_{j_1})}_{j_1}\Big]\|_{op} \\
& \times \|W^{(m_{j_2},n_{j_2})}_{p_{j_2},q_{j_2}}\Big[\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}_2}\underline{w}[z]\Big|\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_{j_2});\rho K^{(m_{j_2},n_{j_2})}_{j_2}\Big]\|_{op} \\
& \times \prod_{\substack{\ell=1\\ \ell\neq j_1,j_2}}^{L} \|\tilde{W}_\ell[z;\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell);\rho K^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}_\ell]\|_{op}\Big\}\,,
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.25}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
|V^{(L,vii)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w}\,|\,\underline{X};K^{(M,N)}]| \;\leq\; & \sum_{j=0}^{L}\|\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}}F_j\|_{op}\prod_{\substack{\ell=0\\ \ell\neq j_1,j_2}}^{L}\|F_\ell[\underline{X}]\|_{op} \\
& \times \prod_{\ell=1}^{L}\|\tilde{W}_\ell[\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell);\rho K^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}_\ell]\|_{op} \\
\leq\; & (L+1)C_\Theta^{L+1}\rho^{-L+1}\prod_{\ell=1}^{L}\|\tilde{W}_\ell[z;\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell);\rho K^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}_\ell]\|_{op}
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.26}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
|V^{(L,viii)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w}\,|\,\underline{X};K^{(M,N)}]| \;\leq\; & \rho^2\prod_{\ell=0}^{L}\|F_\ell[\underline{X}]\|_{op} \\
& \times \Big\{\sum_{j=1}^{L}\|\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}}\tilde{W}_j[z;\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_j);\rho K^{(m_j,n_j)}_j]\|_{op} \\
& \times \prod_{\substack{\ell=1\\ \ell\neq j}}^{L}\|\tilde{W}_\ell[z;\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_j);\rho K^{(m_j,n_j)}_j]\|_{op}\Big\} \\
\leq\; & LC_\Theta^{L+1}\rho^{-L+3} \\
& \times \Big\{\sum_{j=1}^{L}\|W^{(m_j,n_j)}_{p_j,q_j}\Big[\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}}\underline{w}[z]\Big|\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_j);\rho K^{(m_j,n_j)}_j\Big]\|_{op} \\
& \times \prod_{\substack{\ell=1\\ \ell\neq j}}^{L}\|\tilde{W}_\ell[z;\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_\ell);\rho K^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}_\ell]\|_{op}\Big\}\,.
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.27}
$$

7.1.3. *Radial C^1-bound in k.* The discussion of the derivative $|k|^\sigma\partial_{|k|}\big(|k|^{-\sigma}V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}\big)$ is analogous to the case for $\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}}$ with $|\underline{a}|=1$ treated above, and will here not be reiterated. One finds

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \big| |k|^\sigma \partial_{|k|} \big(|k|^{-\sigma} V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w} \,|\, \underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}] \big) \big| \\
& \qquad \leq \; (L+1) C_\Theta^{L+1} \rho^{-L+1} \prod_{\ell=1}^{L} \| \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho(\underline{X} + \underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell, n_\ell)}] \|_{op} \\
& \qquad + L C_\Theta^{L+1} \rho^{-L+2} \\
& \qquad \times \Big\{ \sum_{j=1}^{L} \| W^{(m_j,n_j)}_{p_j,q_j} \Big[|k|^\sigma \partial_{|k|} \big(|k|^{-\sigma} \underline{w}[z] \big) \Big| \underline{X} + \underline{X}_j; K_j^{(m_j,n_j)} \Big] \|_{op} \\
& \qquad \times \prod_{\substack{\ell=1 \\ \ell \neq j}}^{L} \| \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho(\underline{X} + \underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell, n_\ell)}] \|_{op} \Big\} \,, \qquad (7.28)
\end{aligned}
$$

for any $k \in k^{(M,N)}$.

7.1.4. *Bounds involving derivatives in $|p|$ for $|p| > 0$.* The asserted estimate for $|p| > 0$ on $|\partial_{|p|} V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}|$ is obtained precisely in the same way as in the case $|\underline{a}| = 1$, or (7.28). However, one does not obtain a factor ρ from differentiating $\tilde{W}_\ell$, because $\partial_{|p|}$ is invariant under rescaling of photon momenta.

The bound on $|\partial_{|p|} \partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}|$ is derived in a manner very similar to the case discussed under $\underline{2.}$, for $a_0 = 0$ and $|\underline{a}| = 2$. We shall not reiterate the calculations explicitly, but only again note that there is no factor ρ involved in the derivative of $\tilde{W}_\ell$ with respect to $|p|$, in contrast to derivatives with respect to $\underline{X}$.

7.1.5. *Completing the proof.* Collecting the above estimates,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\underline{X}} |V^{(L,i)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w} \,|\, \underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}]| \quad & + \quad \cdots + \sup_{\underline{X}} |V^{(L,viii)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w} \,|\, \underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}]| \\
& + \quad \sup_{\underline{X}} \big| |k|^\sigma \partial_{|k|} \big(|k|^{-\sigma} V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w} \,|\, \underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}] \big) \big| \\
& + \quad \sup_{\underline{X}} \mathbf{1}_{|p|>0} \sum_{|\underline{a}| \leq 1} |\partial_{|p|} \partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{w} \,|\, \underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}]|
\end{aligned}
$$

is bounded by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (L+1)^2 C_\Theta^{L+2} \rho^{-L+1} \prod_{\ell=1}^{L} \Big\{ \sup_{|X| \leq X_0 < 1} \rho \, \| \partial_{X_0} \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho \underline{X}; \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \|_{op} \\
& \qquad + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq |\underline{a}| \leq 2 \\ a_0 = 0}} \sup_{|X| \leq X_0 < 1} \rho^{|\underline{a}|} \, \| \partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho \underline{X}; \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \|_{op} \qquad (7.29) \\
& \qquad + \sup_{k \in k^{(M,N)}} \sup_{|X| \leq X_0 < 1} \rho \, \| |k|^\sigma \partial_{|k|} \big(|k|^{-\sigma} \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho \underline{X}; \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \big) \|_{op} \\
& \qquad + \sup_{|X| \leq X_0 < 1} \mathbf{1}_{|p|>0} \sum_{|\underline{a}| \leq 1} \rho^{|\underline{a}|} \, \| \partial_{|p|} \partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho \underline{X}; \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \|_{op} \Big\} \,.
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(2\pi^{\frac{1}{2}})^{M+N} \sup_{K^{(M,N)}} |k^{(M,N)}|^{-\sigma} \sup_{|X| \leq X_0 < 1} |V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}| \\
&\quad \leq \ (L+1)^2 C_\Theta^{L+2} \rho^{-L+1} \prod_{\ell=1}^{L} \Big\{ \sup_{K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}} (2\pi^{\frac{1}{2}})^{m_\ell+n_\ell} |k_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}|^{-\sigma} \\
&\quad \times \Big[\sup_{\underline{X}} \ \rho \, \| \partial_{X_0} \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho\underline{X}; \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \|_{op} \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq |\underline{a}| \leq 2 \\ a_0 = 0}} \sup_{|X| \leq X_0 < 1} \ \rho^{|\underline{a}|} \, \| \partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho\underline{X}; \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \|_{op} \\
&\quad + \sup_{k \in k^{(M,N)}} \sup_{|X| \leq X_0 < 1} \ \rho \, \| |k|^\sigma \partial_{|k|} \big(|k|^{-\sigma} \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho\underline{X}; \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \big) \|_{op} \\
&\quad + \sup_{|X| \leq X_0 < 1} \ \mathbf{1}_{|p|>0} \sum_{|\underline{a}| \leq 1} \rho^{|\underline{a}|} \, \| \partial_{|p|} \partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho\underline{X}; \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \|_{op} \Big] \Big\} \ .
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.30}
$$

Using the coordinate change $k^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)} \to \rho^{-1} k^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}$ from rescaling, this is bounded by

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(L+1)^2 C_\Theta^{L+2} \rho^{\sigma(M+N)-L+1} \prod_{\ell=1}^{L} \Big\{ \sup_{K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}} (2\pi^{\frac{1}{2}})^{m_\ell+n_\ell} |k_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}|^{-\sigma} \\
&\quad \times \Big[\sup_{|X| \leq X_0 < 1} \ \rho \, \| \partial_{X_0} \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \underline{X}; K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \|_{op}^2 \\
&\qquad\qquad + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq |\underline{a}| \leq 2 \\ a_0 = 0}} \sup_{|X| \leq X_0 < 1} \ \rho^{|\underline{a}|} \, \| \partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \underline{X}; K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \|_{op}^2 \\
&\quad + \sup_{k \in k^{(M,N)}} \sup_{|X| \leq X_0 < 1} \ \rho \, \| |k|^\sigma \partial_{|k|} \big(|k|^{-\sigma} \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \underline{X}; K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \big) \|_{op} \\
&\quad + \sup_{|X| \leq X_0 < 1} \ \mathbf{1}_{|p|>0} \sum_{|\underline{a}| \leq 1} \rho^{|\underline{a}|} \, \| \partial_{|p|} \partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \underline{X}; K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \|_{op} \Big] \Big\} \ .
\end{aligned}
$$

Using Theorem 5.4, we find

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(2\pi^{\frac{1}{2}})^{m_\ell+n_\ell} \sup_{K^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)} \in B_1^{m_\ell+n_\ell}} |k^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}|^{-\sigma} \sup_{\underline{X}} \| \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \underline{X}; K^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] \|_{op} \\
&\quad \leq \ \frac{1}{p_\ell^{p_\ell/2} q_\ell^{q_\ell/2}} \sup_{K^{(m_\ell+p_\ell,n_\ell+q_\ell)} \in B_1^{m_\ell+p_\ell+n_\ell+q_\ell}} |k^{(m_\ell+p_\ell,n_\ell+q_\ell)}|^{-\sigma} \\
&\quad \times (2\pi^{\frac{1}{2}})^{m_\ell+p_\ell+n_\ell+q_\ell} \sup_{\underline{X}} |w_{m_\ell+p_\ell,n_\ell+q_\ell}[z; X; K^{(m_\ell+p_\ell,n_\ell+q_\ell)}]| \\
&\quad \leq \ \frac{1}{p_\ell^{p_\ell/2} q_\ell^{q_\ell/2}} \| w_{m_\ell+p_\ell,n_\ell+q_\ell}[z] \|_\sigma \ .
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.31}
$$

Consequently,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\rho^{(M+N)-1} \| V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}} \|_\sigma^\sharp \\
&\qquad \leq \ 10 \rho^{(1+\sigma)(M+N)-L} (L+1)^2 C_\Theta^{L+2} \prod_{\ell=1}^{L} \frac{\| w_{m_\ell+p_\ell,n_\ell+q_\ell}[z] \|_\sigma^\sharp}{p_\ell^{p_\ell/2} q_\ell^{q_\ell/2}} \ .
\end{aligned}
$$

This proves Lemma 7.1.

8. Proof of Theorem 6.6: Soft photon sum rules

We will next prove that the renormalization map $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ preserves the soft photon sum rules. More precisely, we shall demonstrate that the soft photon sum rules $\mathbf{SR}[\mu]$ are transformed according to

$$\mathbf{SR}[\mu] \rightarrow \mathbf{SR}[\mu\rho^\sigma] \tag{8.1}$$

under $\mathcal{R}_\rho$.

Let us first formulate some remarks regarding how the soft photon sum rules have influenced on our construction of the isospectral renormalization group. We recall from (6.30) that $\mathbf{SR}[\mu]$ involves a derivative in P_f, and a limit $|k| \rightarrow 0$, where k is a photon momentum. In order to accommodate the latter, we did not use photon momentum space integral norms for the definition of the Banach space $\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}$ in Section 5.1, in contrast to [1].

As one will see from the proof, the issue is to verify essentially a purely algebraic property of the renormalization map. However, we emphasize that this is so only because no derivatives of the cutoff operators $\chi_\rho[H_f]$, $\bar\chi_\rho[H_f]$ enter, since they do not depend on P_f. For this reason, we have used H_f, and not a combination of H_f and P_f as the reference operator to slice the Fock space.

Moreover, the soft photon sum rules have also influenced our choice of τ (see Definition 4.1) in the application of the smooth Feshbach map (as an ingredient of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$). We are using $\tau = H_f$, which is also independent of P_f. The issue here is that $\tau = H_f$ appears without a factor $(\bar\chi_\rho\chi_1)^2[H_f]$ in the free resolvent

$$\bar{R}_0[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}] = \Big[H_f + (\bar\chi_\rho^2\chi_1^2)[H_f]\big(\tilde{T}[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + E[z]\big)\Big]^{-1} \tag{8.2}$$

(cf. (6.22), and we recall that $\tilde{T}$ is defined by $T = H_f + \chi_1^2\tilde{T}$) in (8.4) below (where $\underline{X} = (X_0, X)$ is the spectral variable acounting for $\underline{\mathcal{P}} = (H_f, P_f)$). This is in contrast to the P_f-dependent operators (that is, X-dependent terms below). The renormalization map is here so defined that differentiating the resolvents in (8.6) with respect to P_f (that is, X) produces a factor $(\bar\chi_\rho\chi_1)^2$, which is necessary for $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ to preserve the algebraic structure of the soft photon sum rules $\mathbf{SR}[\mu]$.

For brevity, let

$$\Upsilon[z;p;\underline{X}] := \Big\langle \Omega\,,\, \Upsilon_\rho[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}} + \underline{X}]\,\Omega \Big\rangle\,, \tag{8.3}$$

cf. (4.17) and (6.21). Recalling the definition of $W_{p,q}^{m,n}[\underline{X}; z; K^{(m,n)}]$ from (6.25), the soft photon sum rules $\mathbf{SR}[\mu]$ state that for some $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and every unit vector $n \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $|n| = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} g\mu\langle\epsilon(n,\lambda), \partial_X\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} & W_{p_r,q_r}^{m_r,n_r}[\underline{X}; z; K^{(m_r,n_r)}] \\ &= (n_r + q_r + 1)\lim_{x\rightarrow 0} x^{-\sigma} W_{p_r,q_r}^{m_r,n_r+1}[\underline{X}; z; K^{(m_r,n_r+1)}]\Big|_{\tilde{K}_{n_r+1}=(xn,\lambda)} \\ &= (m_r + p_r + 1)\lim_{x\rightarrow 0} x^{-\sigma} W_{p_r,q_r}^{m_r+1,n_r}[\underline{X}; z; K^{(m_r+1,n_r)}]\Big|_{\tilde{K}_{m_r+1}=(xn,\lambda)}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Assuming $\mathbf{SR}[\mu]$, one easily checks that

$$\begin{aligned} & g\mu\langle\epsilon(n,\lambda),\partial_X\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}\bar{R}_0[z;p;\underline{X}] \\ & = -\bar{R}_0[z;p;\underline{X}](\bar{\chi}_\rho^2\chi_1^2)[X_0]\Big(g\mu\langle\epsilon(n,\lambda),\partial_X\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}\tilde{T}[\underline{X};z]\Big)\bar{R}_0[z;p;\underline{X}] \\ & = -\lim_{x\to 0} x^{-\sigma}\bar{R}_0[z;p;\underline{X}](\bar{\chi}_\rho^2\chi_1^2)[X_0]W_{0,0}^{0,1}[\underline{X};z;xn,\lambda](\bar{\chi}_\rho^2\chi_1^2)[X_0]\bar{R}_0[z;p;\underline{X}]\ , \end{aligned} \tag{8.4}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & g\mu\langle\epsilon(n,\lambda),\partial_X\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}\Upsilon[z;X] \\ & \qquad = -\lim_{x\to 0} x^{-\sigma}\Upsilon[z;X]W_{0,0}^{0,1}[\underline{X};z;xn,\lambda](\bar{\chi}_\rho^2\chi_1^2)[X_0]\bar{R}_0[z;p;\underline{X}]\bar{\chi}[X_0]\ . \end{aligned} \tag{8.5}$$

In both (8.4) and (8.5), $W_{0,0}^{0,1}$ can be exchanged with $W_{0,0}^{1,0}$ without any effect.

We next consider $g\langle\epsilon(K),\partial_X\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}\widehat{w}_{M,N}$, which is given by the symmetrization in $K^{(M)}$ and $\tilde{K}^{(N)}$ of

$$\begin{aligned} - \quad & g\mu\rho^{M+N-1}\sum_{L\geq 1}(-1)^L \sum_{\substack{m_j+n_j+p_j+q_j\geq 1 \\ 1\leq j\leq L}} \delta_{N,|\underline{n}|}\delta_{M,|\underline{m}|} \\ \times \quad & \prod_{j=1}^{L}\begin{pmatrix} m_j+p_j \\ p_j \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} n_j+q_j \\ q_j \end{pmatrix} \\ \times \quad & \Big[\ \sum_{r=1}^{L-1}\Big\langle\,\Omega\,,\,\Big[\cdots\langle\epsilon(K),\partial_X\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}(\bar{\chi}_\rho^2\chi_1^2R_0)[E_\rho^{-1}[\widehat{z}];\underline{\mathcal{P}}+\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{\tilde{X}}_r)]\cdots\Big]\,\Omega\,\Big\rangle \\ & +\sum_{r=1}^{L}\Big\langle\,\Omega\,,\,\Big[\cdots\langle\epsilon(K),\partial_X\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}W_{p_r,q_r}^{m_r,n_r}[\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{X}_r);E_\rho^{-1}[\widehat{z}];\rho K_r^{(m_r,n_r)}]\cdots\Big]\,\Omega\,\Big\rangle \\ & \qquad +\Big\langle\,\Omega\,,\,\Big[\langle\epsilon(K),\partial_X\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}\Upsilon[E_\rho^{-1}[\widehat{z}];\underline{\mathcal{P}}+\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{\tilde{X}}_0)]\cdots\cdots\Big]\,\Omega\,\Big\rangle \\ & \qquad +\Big\langle\,\Omega\,,\,\Big[\cdots\cdots\langle\epsilon(K),\partial_X\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}\Upsilon[E_\rho^{-1}[\widehat{z}];\underline{\mathcal{P}}+\rho(\underline{X}+\underline{\tilde{X}}_L)]\Big]\,\Omega\,\Big\rangle\ \ \Big]\ . \end{aligned} \tag{8.6}$$

Substituting (8.4) and (8.5), the first expectation in $[\dots]$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & -\lim_{x\to 0}\rho(\rho x)^{-\sigma}\sum_{r=1}^{L}(m_r+p_r+1) \\ & \qquad\qquad \times V^{(L+1)}_{\underline{m+e_r,p,n,q}}\Big[\underline{w}[E_\rho^{-1}[\widehat{z}]]\Big|\rho\underline{X};\rho K^{(M+1,N)}\Big]\Big|_{K_{M+1}=(Rn,\lambda)} \end{aligned} \tag{8.7}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} & -\lim_{x\to 0}\rho(\rho x)^{-\sigma}\sum_{r=1}^{L}(n_r+1) \\ & \qquad\qquad \times V^{(L+1)}_{\underline{m+e_r,p,n,q}}\Big[\underline{w}[E_\rho^{-1}[\widehat{z}]]\Big|\rho\underline{X};\rho K^{(M+1,N)}\Big]\Big|_{\tilde{K}_{N+1}=(Rn,\lambda)}\ , \end{aligned} \tag{8.8}$$

where $\underline{e_r} := (0,\dots,0,1,0,\dots,0)$ is the L-dimensional unit vector with 1 at the r-th entry. Let us next discuss the expectations in $[\dots]$ which involve derivatives of $\bar{R}_0$ and Υ. Substituting (8.4) and (8.5), the number of interaction operators is increased from L to $L+1$ in every case. Relabelling all operators according to their product order from 1 to $L+1$, the terms on the three last lines in (8.6) can be combined into

$$\lim_{x\to 0}\rho(\rho x)^{-\sigma}\sum_{r=1}^{L+1}V^{(L+1)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}\Big[\underline{w}[E_\rho^{-1}[\widehat{z}]]\Big|\rho\underline{X};\rho K^{(M+1,N)}\Big]\Big|_{\substack{q_r=p_r=n_r=0\\ K_r^{(1,0)}=(Rn,\lambda)}} \tag{8.9}$$

or

$$\lim_{x\to 0}\rho(\rho x)^{-\sigma}\sum_{r=1}^{L+1}V^{(L+1)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}\Big[\underline{w}[E_\rho^{-1}[\widehat{z}]]\Big|\rho\underline{X};\rho K^{(M,N+1)}\Big]\Big|_{\substack{q_r=p_r=m_r=0\\ K_r^{(1,0)}=(Rn,\lambda)}} \tag{8.10}$$

The terms corresponding to $r=1$ and $r=L+1$ are obtained from derivatives of Υ. Since this expectation value contains $L+1$ interaction operators, we rearrange the sum over L accordingly.

In the special case $M+N=1$, there notably is an additional contribution

$$\begin{aligned} &g\mu\langle\epsilon(n,\lambda),\partial_X\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}(\Upsilon\tilde{T})[z;\rho\underline{X}]\\ &\quad=-\lim_{x\to 0}\rho(\rho x)^{-\sigma}\Upsilon[z;p;\underline{X}]W^{0,1}_{0,0}[\rho\underline{X};z;xn,\lambda]\Upsilon[z;p;\underline{X}]\,, \end{aligned} \tag{8.11}$$

where $W^{0,1}_{0,0}$ can be exchanged with $W^{1,0}_{0,0}$ without any effect.

Thus, after rearranging the terms in the sum over L, and using

$$(n_r+q_r+1)\begin{pmatrix} n_r+q_r\\ q_r\end{pmatrix}=(n_r+1)\begin{pmatrix} n_r+q_r+1\\ q_r\end{pmatrix}\,, \tag{8.12}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -\;&\lim_{x\to 0}\rho^{M+N}(\rho x)^{-\sigma}\sum_{L\geq 1}(-1)^L\sum_{\substack{m_j+n_j+p_j+q_j\geq 1\\ 0<j\leq L\\ m_r+n_r+p_r+q_r\geq 0}}\delta_{N,|\underline{n}|}\delta_{M,|\underline{m}|}(n_r+1)\\ &\times\sum_{r=1}^{L}\begin{pmatrix} n_r+q_r+1\\ q_r\end{pmatrix}\Big[\prod_{j=1}^{L}\begin{pmatrix} m_j+p_j\\ p_j\end{pmatrix}\Big]\Big[\prod_{\substack{j=1\\ j\neq r}}^{L}\begin{pmatrix} n_j+q_j\\ q_j\end{pmatrix}\Big]\\ &\times V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n+e_r,q}}\Big[\underline{w}[E_\rho^{-1}[\widehat{z}]]\Big|\rho\underline{X};\rho K^{(M+1,N)}\Big]\Big|_{\tilde{K}_{N+1}=(xn,\lambda)}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{8.13}$$

or the corresponding expression from interchanging (n_r,q_r,N) and (m_r,p_r,M). Relabelling the index $n_r\to n_r+1$, we have $\delta_{N,\sum n_i}\to\delta_{N+1,\sum n_i}$, and thus indeed find

$$\begin{aligned} &g\mu\rho^\sigma\langle\epsilon(n,\lambda),\partial_X\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}\widehat{w}_{M,N}[\widehat{z};\underline{\mathcal{P}};K^{(M,N)}]\\ &\qquad=(N+1)\lim_{x\to 0}x^{-\sigma}\widehat{w}_{M,N+1}[\underline{\mathcal{P}};z;K^{(M)},\tilde{K}^{(N+1)}]\Big|_{\tilde{K}_{N+1}=(xn,\lambda)}\,, \end{aligned}$$

or likewise the corresponding expression obtained from interchanging N and M.

In particular, we observe that the parameter μ is rescaled by a factor ρ^σ so that

$$\mathbf{SR}[\mu]\to\mathbf{SR}[\mu\rho^\sigma] \tag{8.14}$$

under the action of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$, as claimed.

Moreover, we observe that in the limit $\sigma\to 0$, μ becomes invariant under $\mathcal{R}_\rho$, and has the constant value $\mu=1$ (the value 1 is connected to the normalization condition (1.15)).

9. PROOF OF THEOREM 6.6: CODIMENSION TWO CONTRACTIVITY FOR $p \neq 0$

Let us first address the case of non-vanishing conserved total momentum $0 < |p| < \frac{1}{3}$. Our aim is to prove that the renormalization transformation diminishes the interaction essentially by a factor ρ^σ.

Using Theorem 6.4, Lemma 7.1, and $\binom{m+p}{p} \leq 2^{m+p}$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{w}_{M,N}[\zeta]\|^\sharp_\sigma \quad &\leq \quad \sum_{L=1}^\infty 10\, C_\Theta^2 (L+1)^2 \Big(\frac{C_\Theta}{\rho}\Big)^L (2\rho^{1+\sigma})^{M+N} \\ &\quad \times \sum_{\substack{m_1+\cdots+m_l=M, \\ n_1+\cdots+n_L=N}} \; \sum_{\substack{p_1,q_1,\dots,p_L,q_L: \\ m_\ell+p_\ell+n_\ell+q_\ell \geq 1}} \\ &\quad \times \prod_{\ell=1}^L \Big\{ \Big(\frac{2}{\sqrt{p_\ell}}\Big)^{p_\ell} \Big(\frac{2}{\sqrt{q_\ell}}\Big)^{q_\ell} \|w_{m_\ell+p_\ell, n_\ell+q_\ell}[z]\|^\sharp_\sigma \Big\} \end{aligned} \tag{9.1}$$

The sum over $\underline{m, p, n, q}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\underline{\widehat{w}}_1[\zeta]\|^\sharp_{\sigma,\xi} \quad &\leq \quad 20\, C_\Theta^2 \rho^{1+\sigma} \sum_{M+N\geq 1} \xi^{-M-N} \sum_{L=1}^\infty (L+1)^2 \Big(\frac{C_\Theta}{\rho}\Big)^L \\ &\quad \times \sum_{\substack{m_1+\cdots+m_l=M, \\ n_1+\cdots+n_L=N}} \; \sum_{\substack{p_1,q_1,\dots,p_L,q_L: \\ m_\ell+p_\ell+n_\ell+q_\ell \geq 1}} \prod_{\ell=1}^L \xi^{m_\ell+n_\ell} \\ &\quad \times \prod_{\ell=1}^L \Big\{ \Big(\frac{2\xi}{\sqrt{p_\ell}}\Big)^{p_\ell} \Big(\frac{2\xi}{\sqrt{q_\ell}}\Big)^{q_\ell} \xi^{-(m_\ell+p_\ell+n_\ell+q_\ell)} \|w_{m_\ell+p_\ell, n_\ell+q_\ell}[z]\|^\sharp_\sigma \Big\} \\ &\leq \quad 20\, C_\Theta^2 \rho^{1+\sigma} \sum_{L=1}^\infty (L+1)^2 \Big(\frac{C_\Theta}{\rho}\Big)^L \\ &\quad \times \Big\{ \sum_{M+N\geq 1} \Big(\sum_{p=0}^M \Big(\frac{2\xi}{\sqrt{p}}\Big)^p\Big) \Big(\sum_{q=0}^N \Big(\frac{2\xi}{\sqrt{q}}\Big)^q\Big) \xi^{-(M+N)} \|w_{M,N}[z]\|^\sharp_\sigma \Big\}^L \\ &\leq \quad 20\, C_\Theta^2 \rho^{1+\sigma} \sum_{L=1}^\infty (L+1)^2 \Big(\frac{C_\Theta}{\rho}\Big)^L A^{2L} (\|\underline{w}_1[z]\|^\sharp_{\xi,\sigma})^L \end{aligned} \tag{9.2}$$

with

$$A := \sum_{p=0}^\infty \Big(\frac{2\xi}{\sqrt{p}}\Big)^p \leq \sum_{p=0}^\infty (2\xi)^p = \frac{1}{1-2\xi} \leq \frac{1}{2}\ , \tag{9.3}$$

assuming that $\xi \leq \frac{1}{4}$. Furthermore,

$$B := \frac{C_\Theta}{\rho(1-2\xi)^2} \|\underline{w}_1\|_{\xi,\sigma} \leq \frac{4C_\Theta}{\rho} \|\underline{w}_1\|_{\xi,\sigma}\ . \tag{9.4}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{L=1}^{\infty}(L+1)^2 B^L &= \Big(B\frac{d^2}{dB^2}+\frac{d}{dB}\Big)\sum_{L=0}^{\infty}B^L-1\\ &= \frac{1}{(1-B)^2}-1-\frac{B}{(1-B)^3}\leq 12B\;. \end{aligned}\tag{9.5}$$

We consequently find

$$\begin{aligned}\|\underline{\widehat{w}}_1[\zeta]\|^{\sharp}_{\xi,\sigma} &\leq 240\, C_\Theta^2\rho^{1+\sigma}B\\ &= 960C_\Theta^3\rho^{\sigma}\|\underline{w}_1\|^{\sharp}_{\xi,\sigma}\leq\frac{\epsilon}{2}\end{aligned}\tag{9.6}$$

by choosing $\rho=(2c_2)^{-1/\sigma}$ with $c_2:=960C_\Theta^3$.

We next discuss the case $M+N=0$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{w}_{0,0}[\zeta;\underline{X}] &= H\big[\mathcal{R}_\rho[E[z]\oplus T\oplus\underline{0}_1]\big]\\ &\qquad+\rho^{-1}\sum_{L=2}^{\infty}(-1)^{L-1}\sum_{\substack{p_1,q_1,\dots,p_L,q_L:\\ p_\ell+q_\ell\geq 1}}V^{(L)}_{\underline{0,p,0,q}}[\underline{X}]\;,\end{aligned}\tag{9.7}$$

with

$$\rho^{-1}\|V^{(L)}_{\underline{0,p,0,q}}\|^{\sharp}_{\sigma}\leq 10\,(L+1)^2C_\Theta^2\rho^{-L}\prod_{\ell=1}^{\infty}\frac{\|w_{p_\ell,q_\ell}[z]\|}{p_\ell^{p_\ell/2}q_\ell^{q_\ell/2}}\;,\tag{9.8}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{R}_\rho\Big[E[z]\oplus T\oplus\underline{0}_1\Big]\\ &\qquad= E[z]\oplus\big(X_0+\big(\rho^{-1}w_{0,0}[z;\rho\underline{X}]-X_0\big)\Upsilon_\rho[z;\rho\underline{X}]\chi_1^2[X_0]\big)\oplus\underline{0}_1\;.\end{aligned}$$

Writing $P_{\bar{\chi}_1}:=P_{\bar{\chi}_1[|X|\leq X_0]}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big\|P_{\mathfrak{T}}\Big(\mathcal{R}_\rho[E[z]\oplus T\oplus\underline{0}_1]-T_0^{(p;\rho\lambda)}\Big)\Big\|_{\mathfrak{T}}\\ &\qquad=\sup\Big\{\Big\|P^{\perp}_{\bar{\chi}_1}\Big(P_{\mathfrak{T}}\mathcal{R}_\rho[E[z]\oplus T\oplus\underline{0}_1]-T_0^{(p;\rho\lambda)}\Big)\Big\|^{\sharp}\,,\\ &\qquad\qquad\frac{1}{K_\Theta}\Big\|P_{\bar{\chi}_1}\Big(P_{\mathfrak{T}}\mathcal{R}_\rho[E[z]\oplus T\oplus\underline{0}_1]-T_0^{(p;\rho\lambda)}\Big)\Big\|^{\sharp}\Big\}\\ &\qquad\leq\sup\Big\{\delta\,,\,\frac{1}{K_\Theta}\Big\|P_{\bar{\chi}_1}\Big(P_{\mathfrak{T}}\mathcal{R}_\rho[E[z]\oplus T\oplus\underline{0}_1]-T_0^{(p;\rho\lambda)}\Big)\Big\|^{\sharp}\Big\}\end{aligned}\tag{9.9}$$

(the projection $P_{\mathfrak{T}}:\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}\to\mathfrak{T}$ is defined in (6.11)). A straightforward calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\|P_{\bar{\chi}_1[|X|\leq X_0]}\Big(P_{\mathfrak{T}}\mathcal{R}_\rho[E[z]\oplus T\oplus\underline{0}_1]-T_0^{(p;\rho\lambda)}\Big)\Big\|^{\sharp} &\leq \tilde{K}_\Theta\|P_{|X|\leq X_0\leq 3/4}\big(T-T_0^{(p;\lambda)}\big)\|^{\sharp}\\ &\leq \tilde{K}_\Theta\delta\;,\end{aligned}\tag{9.10}$$

for a constant $1 \leq \tilde{K}_\Theta < \infty$, which only depends on C_Θ and numerical factors independent of $\epsilon, \delta, \lambda$. Hence, choosing $K_\Theta := \tilde{K}_\Theta$ in (5.18), we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\widehat{T} - T_0^{(p;\rho\lambda)}\|_{\mathfrak{T}} \;&\leq\; \|P_{\mathfrak{T}} \mathcal{R}_\rho[E[z] \oplus T \oplus \underline{0}_1] - T_0^{(p;\rho\lambda)}\|_{\mathfrak{T}} \\
&+\; \frac{1}{\rho} \sum_{L \geq 2} \sum_{\substack{p_1, q_1, \dots, p_L, q_L: \\ p_\ell + q_\ell \geq 1}} \Big[\sup_{\underline{X}} |\partial_{X_0} V^{(L)}_{\underline{0,p,0,q}}[\underline{X}]| \\
&+\; \sum_{|\underline{a}|=1} \sup_{\underline{X}} |\partial_{|p|} \partial^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{X}} V^{(L)}_{\underline{0,p,0,q}}[\underline{X}]| + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq |\underline{a}| \leq 2 \\ a_0 = 0}} \sup_{\underline{X}} |\partial^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{X}} V^{(L)}_{\underline{0,p,0,q}}[\underline{X}]| \Big] \\
&\leq\; \delta + 10\, C_\Theta^2 \sum_{L=2}^\infty (L+1)^2 \Big(\frac{C_\Theta}{\rho} \Big)^L \Big(\sum_{p+q \geq 1} \|w_{p,q}[z]\|_\sigma^\sharp \Big)^L \\
&\leq\; \delta + 10\, C_\Theta^2 \sum_{L=2}^\infty (L+1)^2 \Big(\frac{C_\Theta}{\rho} \Big)^L \Big(\xi \sum_{p+q \geq 1} \xi^{-p-q} \|w_{p,q}[z]\|_\sigma^\sharp \Big)^L \\
&\leq\; \delta + 10\, C_\Theta^2 \sum_{L=2}^\infty (L+1)^2 \Big(\frac{C_\Theta \xi}{\rho} \Big)^L \Big(\|\underline{w}_1\|_{\xi,\sigma}^\sharp \Big)^L \\
&\leq\; \delta + 120\, C_\Theta \Big(\frac{C_\Theta \xi}{\rho} \|\underline{w}_1\|_{\xi,\sigma}^\sharp \Big)^2 \\
&\leq\; \delta + 120\, \frac{C_\Theta^3 \xi^2}{\rho^2} \epsilon^2 \\
&\leq\; \delta + \epsilon \,, \qquad (9.11)
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon \;&<\; \epsilon_0 \;<\; \rho^2 \\
\xi \;&:=\; c_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \;\text{ where }\; c_1 \;:=\; \frac{1}{120 C_\Theta^3} \,, \\
\rho \;&=\; (2c_2)^{-1/\sigma} \;\text{ where }\; c_2 = 960 C_\Theta^3 \,, \qquad (9.12)
\end{aligned}$$

as our choice of constants.

Finally, let $\widehat{E}[\zeta] := \widehat{w}_{0,0}[\zeta; \underline{0}]$. With $E[z] = w_{0,0}[z; \underline{0}]$ and $\zeta = E_\rho[z] = \frac{1}{\rho} E[z]$, we derive from (9.7) that

$$\widehat{E}[\zeta] = \zeta + \rho^{-1} \sum_{L=2}^\infty \sum_{\substack{p_1, q_1, \dots, p_L, q_L: \\ p_\ell + q_\ell \geq 1}} V^{(L)}_{\underline{0,p,0,q}}[\underline{0}] \,. \qquad (9.13)$$

We can again use the bounds (9.8) and (9.11), whereby

$$\begin{aligned}
|\partial^a_{|p|} (\widehat{E}[\zeta] - \zeta)| \;&\leq\; 120 C_\Theta \Big(\frac{C_\Theta \xi}{\rho} \|\partial^a_{|p|} \underline{w}_1\|^\sharp \Big)^2 \\
&\leq\; 120\, \frac{C_\Theta^3 \xi^2}{\rho^2} \epsilon^2 \;<\; \epsilon \,, \qquad (9.14)
\end{aligned}$$

for $a = 0, 1$ and (9.12). Thus,

$$\mathcal{R}_\rho : \mathfrak{D}^{(\mu)}(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda) \to \mathfrak{D}^{(\rho^\sigma \mu)}(\widehat{\epsilon}, \widehat{\delta}, \widehat{\lambda}) \,, \qquad (9.15)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\epsilon} &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \\ \widehat{\delta} &\leq \delta+\epsilon \\ \widehat{\lambda} &= \rho\lambda \end{aligned} \tag{9.16}$$

given the (σ-dependent) choice of parameters (9.12).

This proves the assertion of Theorem 6.6 for the case $0 < |p| < \frac{1}{3}$.

10. Proof of Theorem 6.6: Codimension two contractivity for $p = 0$

Next, we address the case of vanishing conserved total momentum $p = 0$. Our aim is to prove that instead of only ρ^σ, the bounds on the interaction gain a full factor ρ from the renormalization transformation. This holds, in particular, *independently* of the infrared regularization σ.

For $M + N \geq 2$, (9.1) and the subsequent calculations leading to (9.6) imply that (using the same notation)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\underline{w}}_2\|^\sharp_{\xi,\sigma} &\leq 40C_\Theta^2\rho^{2(1+\sigma)}\sum_{L=1}^{\infty}(L+1)^2\Big(\frac{4C_\Theta}{\rho}\Big)^L(\|\underline{w}_1[z]\|^\sharp_{\xi,\sigma})^L \\ &\leq 480C_\Theta^3\rho^{1+\sigma}B \\ &\leq 1920C_\Theta^3\rho\|\underline{w}_2\|_{\xi,\sigma} \end{aligned} \tag{10.1}$$

($\underline{w}_2$ is defined in (5.23)).

For $M + N = 1$, we use the soft photon sum rules $\mathbf{SR}[\mu]$, which state that for any arbitrary unit vector $n \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, and some $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\lim_{x\to 0} x^{-\sigma} w_{1,0}[z;\underline{X};xn,\lambda] = g\mu\big\langle\epsilon(n,\lambda),\partial_X\big\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} T[z;\underline{X}]\ , \tag{10.2}$$

and likewise for $w_{0,1}$. If $p = 0$, $T \in \mathfrak{T}$ is $O(3)$-invariant, and is a function only of X_0 and X^2. Therefore,

$$\partial_X\Big|_{X=0} T[z;\underline{X};p=0] = 0\ , \tag{10.3}$$

so that

$$\lim_{X\to 0}\lim_{x\to 0} x^{-\sigma} w_{1,0}[z;\underline{X};xn,\lambda] = 0\ , \tag{10.4}$$

and hence

$$\lim_{X\to 0}\lim_{x\to 0} w_{1,0}[z;\underline{X};xn,\lambda] = 0\ , \tag{10.5}$$

and likewise for $w_{0,1}$. This is the crucial step where the soft photon sum rules are used to prove irrelevance of the generalized Wick kernels of degree 1. The consequence of (10.5) is that $w_{0,1}$ and $w_{1,0}$ (which superficially scale marginally, that is, with a factor $\rho^\sigma \to 1$ as $\sigma \to 0$) have a Taylor expansion in $|k|$ and $\underline{X}$ with zero constant coefficient, and thus scale with a factor ρ.

The leading term in $\widehat{w}_{1,0}$ corresponding to $L = 1$ (where $\underline{p}$ and $\underline{q}$ are necessarily zero) is given by

$$V^{(L=1)}_{\underline{1,0,0,0}}[\underline{w}|\underline{X};K] = \Big\langle \Omega\,,\; F_0[\underline{X}+\underline{k}]\tilde{W}_1[z;\rho\underline{X};\rho K]F_1[\underline{X}]\Omega \Big\rangle\,, \tag{10.6}$$

which can be estimated by

$$\|V^{(L=1)}_{\underline{1,0,0,0}}[z]\|^\sharp_\sigma \quad\le\quad 2\|w_{1,0}[z;\rho\underline{X};\rho K]\|^\sharp_\sigma \|F_0\|^\sharp \|F_1\|^\sharp\,. \tag{10.7}$$

This is obtained from applying the definition of the norms $\|\cdot\|^\sharp_\sigma$ in (3.8) and $\|\cdot\|^\sharp$ in (5.19), and using the Leibnitz rule repeatedly. An additional derivative with respect to $|k|$ in F_0 is accounted for by the factor 2, where we have used

$$\begin{aligned} \||k|^\sigma\partial_{|k|}(|k|^\sigma F_0 w_{1,0}F_1)\|_\sigma \quad&=\quad \||k|^\sigma\partial_{|k|}(F_0(|k|^\sigma w_{1,0})F_1)\|_\sigma \\ &\le\quad \big(\sup_{|X|\le X_0<1}\|\partial_{|k|}F_0[\underline{X}+\underline{k}]\|_{op}\big)\|w_{1,0}\|^\sharp_\sigma\|F_1\|^\sharp \\ &\qquad\qquad +\|F_0\|^\sharp\||k|^\sigma\partial_{|k|}(|k|^\sigma w_{1,0})\|^\sharp_\sigma\|F_1\|^\sharp\,, \end{aligned} \tag{10.8}$$

since

$$\sup_{|X|\le X_0<1}\|\partial_{|k|}F_0[\underline{X}+\underline{k}]\|_{op} \le \sum_{|\underline{a}|=1}\,\sup_{|X|\le X_0<1}\|\partial^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{X}}F_0\|_{op} < \|F_0\|^\sharp\,. \tag{10.9}$$

Use of (10.5) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{1,0}[z;\rho\underline{X};\rho K]\|_\sigma \quad&\le\quad \rho\sum_{\substack{|\underline{a}|=1\\ a_0=0}}\|\partial^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{X}}w_{1,0}\|_\sigma + \rho\||k|^\sigma\partial_{|k|}\big(|k|^{-\sigma}w_{1,0}\big)\|_\sigma \\ &\le\quad \rho\|w_{1,0}\|^\sharp_\sigma\,, \end{aligned} \tag{10.10}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{1,0}[z;\rho\underline{X};\rho K]\|^\sharp_\sigma \quad&=\quad \sum_{a_0=0,1}\|\partial^{a_0}_{X_0}w_{1,0}[z;\rho\underline{X};\rho K]\|_\sigma \\ &\qquad\quad + \sum_{\substack{1\le|\underline{a}|\le 2\\ a_0=0}}\|\partial^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{X}}w_{1,0}[z;\rho\underline{X};\rho K]\|_\sigma \\ &\qquad\quad +\||k|^\sigma\partial_{|k|}\big(|k|^{-\sigma}w_{1,0}[z;\rho\underline{X};\rho K]\big)\|_\sigma \\ &\le\quad \rho\|\partial_{X_0}w_{1,0}\|_\sigma + 2\rho\sum_{\substack{1\le|\underline{a}|\le 2\\ a_0=0}}\|\partial^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{X}}w_{1,0}\|_\sigma \\ &\qquad\quad +2\rho\||k|^\sigma\partial_{|k|}\big(|k|^{-\sigma}w_{1,0}\big)\|_\sigma \\ &\le\quad 2\rho\|w_{1,0}\|^\sharp_\sigma\,. \end{aligned} \tag{10.11}$$

We note that since the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\xi,\sigma}$ does not involve any derivative with respect to $|p|$ if $p=0$, all derivatives scale with a factor ρ. Moreover,

$$\|F_0\|^\sharp\,,\ \|F_1\|^\sharp \quad\le\quad C_\Theta\,. \tag{10.12}$$

Consequently,

$$\|V^{(L=1)}_{\underline{1,0,0,0}}[z]\|^\sharp_\sigma \le 10\rho C_\Theta^2\|w_{1,0}\|^\sharp_\sigma\,. \tag{10.13}$$

The case for $\widehat{w}_{0,1}$ is identical.

The sum of terms contributing to $\widehat{w}_{1,0}$ for $L \geq 2$ can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & 20\, C_\Theta^2 \sum_{L=2}^\infty (L+1)^2 \Big(\frac{C_\Theta}{\rho} \Big)^L (2\rho^{1+\sigma})^{M+N} \\ & \qquad \times \sum_{\substack{m_1+\cdots+m_l=M, \\ n_1+\cdots+n_L=N}} \ \sum_{\substack{p_1,q_1,\dots,p_L,q_L: \\ m_\ell+p_\ell+n_\ell+q_\ell\geq 1}} \\ & \qquad \times \prod_{\ell=1}^L \Big\{ \Big(\frac{2}{\sqrt{p_\ell}} \Big)^{p_\ell} \Big(\frac{2}{\sqrt{q_\ell}} \Big)^{q_\ell} \| w_{m_\ell+p_\ell, n_\ell+q_\ell}[z] \|_\sigma \Big\} \\ & \leq \ 20\, C_\Theta^2 \rho^{1+\sigma} \xi \sum_{L=2}^\infty (L+1)^2 B^L \\ & \leq \ 3840 \frac{C_\Theta^4}{\rho}\, \xi\, \| \underline{w}_1 \|_{\xi,\sigma}^2 \ , \end{aligned} \tag{10.14}$$

by use of similar arguments as in the derivation of (9.6), and $\sum_{L=2}^\infty (L+1)^2 B^L < 12 B^2$ for $B = \frac{4C_\Theta}{\rho} \| \underline{w}_1 \|_{\xi,\sigma} < \frac{1}{10}$.

In conclusion,

$$\begin{aligned} \| \widehat{\underline{w}}_1 \|_{\xi,\sigma}^\sharp & \leq \ \xi^{-1} \| \widehat{w}_{1,0} \|_\sigma^\sharp + \xi^{-1} \| \widehat{w}_{0,1} \|_\sigma^\sharp + \| \widehat{w}_2 \|_{\sigma,\xi} \\ & \leq \ (20 C_\Theta^2 + 7680 \frac{C_\Theta^4 \epsilon}{\rho^2} + 1920 C_\Theta^3) \rho\, \| \underline{w}_1 \|_{\xi,\sigma}^\sharp \\ & < \ 9620 C_\Theta^4 \rho\, \epsilon \ , \end{aligned} \tag{10.15}$$

independently of σ, for $\epsilon < \epsilon_0 < \rho^2$.

In the case $M + N = 0$, we again choose $K_\Theta := \tilde{K}_\Theta$, see (5.18), as in (9.11), and we find

$$\begin{aligned} \| \widehat{T} - T_0^{(p=0;\rho\lambda)} \|_{\mathfrak{T}} & \leq \ \delta + 120\, C_\Theta \Big(\frac{C_\Theta \xi}{\rho} \| \underline{w}_1 \|_{\xi,\sigma}^\sharp \Big)^2 \\ & \leq \ \delta + 120 \frac{C_\Theta^3 \xi^2}{\rho^2} \epsilon^2 \\ & < \ \delta + \epsilon \end{aligned} \tag{10.16}$$

using $\epsilon < \epsilon_0 < \rho^2$, and $\xi = (120 C_\Theta^3)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = c_1^{\frac{1}{2}}$, all independent of σ.

Therefore,

$$\mathcal{R}_\rho : \mathfrak{D}^{(\mu)}(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda) \to \mathfrak{D}^{(\rho^\sigma \mu)}(\widehat{\epsilon}, \widehat{\delta}, \widehat{\lambda}) \tag{10.17}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\epsilon} \ & < \ c_4 \rho\, \epsilon \ \text{ where } \ c_4 := 9620 C_\Theta^4 \\ \widehat{\delta} \ & < \ \delta + \epsilon \\ \widehat{\lambda} \ & = \ \rho\lambda \ , \end{aligned} \tag{10.18}$$

independently of σ. Thus, $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ is codimension 2 contractive with $\widehat{\epsilon} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for $\rho < \frac{1}{2c_4}$.

This concludes the proof of Theorem 6.6.

11. The first Feshbach decimation step

One of our key aims is to find the ground state eigenvalue and eigenvector of the fiber Hamiltonian $H(p,\sigma)$ on $\mathcal{F}$, using the isospectral, operator-theoretic renormalization group constructed in our previous analysis. $H(p,\sigma)$ has been defined in (1.19), and is written in Wick ordered normal form in (11.5) below.

We use the following strategy.

In this section, we construct an initial condition for the renormalization group recursion by isospectrally mapping the fiber Hamiltonian $H(p,\sigma)$ on $\mathcal{F}$ to an effective Hamiltonian on $\mathcal{H}_{red} = \mathbf{1}[H_f < 1]\mathcal{F}$. The latter is parametrized by an element $\underline{w}^{(0)}$ inside a polydisc $\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon_0, \delta_0, \frac{1}{2})$ (defined in (6.13)). We refer to this procedure as the "first Feshbach decimation step". For sufficiently small values of the electron charge g, the constants ϵ_0, δ_0 are sufficiently small that $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ is codimension 2 contractive on $\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon_0, \delta_0, \frac{1}{2})$ according to Theorem 6.6.

Thus, iteration of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ generates a convergent sequence $\{\underline{w}^{(n)}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ in $\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}$. In Section 12, we show that in the limit $n \to \infty$, the spectral problem of finding the ground state for $H[\underline{w}^{(n)}]$ can be explicitly solved. By a recursive use of the Feshbach isospectrality theorem, Theorem 4.2, this result allows us to reconstruct the ground state of $H(p,\sigma)$.

11.1. **The result.** In this section, we prove the following theorem, which provides an initial condition $\underline{w}^{(0)}$ for the isospectral renormalization group.

We recall here that $\mathfrak{FP}(\mathcal{F}, \chi_1[H_f])$ denotes the set of Feshbach pairs corresponding to $\chi_1[H_f]$, cf. Definition 4.1, and χ_1 is the smooth cutoff function defined in (5.1). Moreover, we recall the definition of the injective embedding $H : \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0} \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{red})$ (see (5.26)) from Section 5, where $(\underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}, \| \cdot \|_{\sigma,\xi})$ is a Banach space of generalized Wick kernels.

Theorem 11.1. *Assume that* $0 \leq |p| < \frac{1}{3}$, $\sigma \geq 0$, *and* $\zeta \in D_{\frac{1}{9}}$. *Then, for sufficiently small values of the electron charge* g,

$$(11.1) \quad \Big(H(p,\sigma) - \frac{|p|^2}{2} - \frac{g^2}{2}\big\langle \Omega, A_{\kappa_\sigma}^2 \Omega \big\rangle + \zeta \, , \, H_f\Big) \in \mathfrak{FP}(\mathcal{F}, \chi_1[H_f]) \, .$$

For sufficiently small values of the electron charge g, *there exist small constants* $\epsilon_0, \delta_0, \xi > 0$ *independent of* σ, *and*

$$(11.2) \quad \underline{w}^{(0)} = (E^{(0)}, T^{(0)}, \underline{w}_1^{(0)}) \in \mathfrak{D}(\epsilon_0, \delta_0, 2^{-1}) \subset \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}$$

such that

$$(11.3) \quad H[\underline{w}^{(0)}[z]] = F_{\chi_1[H_f]}\Big(H(p,\sigma) - \frac{|p|^2}{2} - \frac{g^2}{2}\big\langle \Omega, A_{\kappa_\sigma}^2 \Omega \big\rangle + \zeta \, , \, H_f\Big) \, .$$

The spectral parameters z *and* ζ *are related by*

$$(11.4) \quad z = \zeta - E^{(0)}[\zeta] =: J_{(-1)}[\zeta] \, ,$$

and $z \in D_{\frac{1}{10}}$. *The parameters* ϵ_0, δ_0 *are* $O(g)$.

Proof. We closely follow the proof of Theorem 6.6. However, while in Theorem 6.6, we were concerned with bounded operators on $\mathcal{H}_{red}$, we are now studying unbounded operators on $\mathcal{F}$. Thus, instead of operator bounds, we use relative operator bounds of the interaction operator with respect to the free Hamiltonian. Otherwise, the arguments are identical; for the algebraic part of the proof related to Wick ordering, essentially no modification is required.

We recall the notation

$$\underline{\mathcal{P}} = (H_f, P_f) \ ,$$

and

$$\underline{X} = (X_0, X) \ \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^3 \ ,$$

which denotes the spectral variable corresponding to $\underline{\mathcal{P}}$.

11.1.1. *Generalized Wick normal form of $H(p,\sigma)$.* We rewrite the fiber Hamiltonian $H(p,\sigma)$, defined in (1.19), in Wick ordered form

$$H(p,\sigma) \ = \ \frac{p^2}{2} + \frac{g^2}{2}\big\langle \Omega, A_{\kappa_\sigma}^2 \Omega\big\rangle + T[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + W \ , \tag{11.5}$$

where

$$T[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] \ = \ H_f - |p| P_f^{\|} + \frac{1}{2} P_f^2 \tag{11.6}$$

is the free Hamiltonian. Since $0 \leq |p| < \frac{1}{3}$, and $|P_f| \leq H_f$,

$$\frac{H_f}{2} < T[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] < 2H_f \tag{11.7}$$

is immediately clear.

The interaction Hamiltonian is given by

$$W \ = \ \sum_{1 \leq M+N \leq 2} W_{M,N} \ , \tag{11.8}$$

where

$$\sum_{M+N=1} W_{M,N} \ = \ -g\big\langle (p - P_f), A_{\kappa_\sigma} \big\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tag{11.9}$$

$$\sum_{M+N=2} W_{M,N} \ = \ \frac{1}{2} g^2 \ : \ A_{\kappa_\sigma}^2 \ : \tag{11.10}$$

with $M, N \in \{0,1,2\}$. Here, $: (\cdot) :$ denotes Wick ordering.

The generalized Wick kernels $w_{M,N}$ corresponding to the generalized Wick monomials $W_{M,N}$ (for definitions, see Section 5) are given by

$$w_{1,0}[\underline{X};K] \ = \ -g\big\langle (p - X), \epsilon(K)\big\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} \kappa_\sigma(|k|) \ = \ w_{0,1}^*[\underline{X};K] \tag{11.11}$$

for $M + N = 1$. Moreover,

$$w_{1,1}[\underline{X};K,\tilde{K}] \ = \ g^2 \big\langle \epsilon(K), \epsilon(\tilde{K})\big\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} \kappa_\sigma(|k|)\kappa_\sigma(|\tilde{k}|) \tag{11.12}$$

and

$$w_{2,0}[\underline{X};K,\tilde{K}] \ = \ \frac{1}{2} g^2 \big\langle \epsilon(K), \epsilon(\tilde{K})\big\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} \kappa_\sigma(|k|)\kappa_\sigma(|\tilde{k}|) \ = \ w_{0,2}^*[\underline{X};K,\tilde{K}] \tag{11.13}$$

for $M+N=2$. The smooth cutoff function κ_σ, which implements the ultraviolet and infrared regularization, has been defined in (1.14).

11.1.2. *Soft photon sum rules for $H(p,\sigma)$.* The generalized Wick kernels $w_{M,N}$ together with T satisfy the soft photon sum rules $\mathbf{SR}[\mu=1]$ in (6.30). Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} g\big\langle \epsilon(n,\lambda), \partial_X \big\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} T[\underline{X}] &= g\big\langle \epsilon(n,\lambda), \partial_X \big\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Big[X_0 - |p| X^{\|} + \frac{X^2}{2} \Big] \\ &= -g\big\langle (p-X), \epsilon(n,\lambda) \big\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} \\ &= \lim_{x\to 0} x^{-\sigma} w_{1,0}[\underline{X};K]\Big|_{k=xn} \\ &= \lim_{x\to 0} x^{-\sigma} w_{0,1}[\underline{X};K]\Big|_{k=xn} , \end{aligned} \tag{11.14}$$

since

$$\lim_{x\to 0} x^{-\sigma}\kappa_\sigma(x) = 1 , \tag{11.15}$$

see (1.15). We note that the value of μ depends on this normalization condition. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} g\big\langle \epsilon(n,\lambda), \partial_X \big\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} w_{1,0}[\underline{X};\tilde{K}] &= -g^2 \Big[\big\langle \epsilon(n,\lambda), \partial_X \big\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} \big\langle (p-X), \epsilon(\tilde{K}) \big\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Big] \kappa_\sigma(|\tilde{k}|) \\ &= g^2 \big\langle \epsilon(n,\lambda) \, , \, \epsilon(\tilde{K}) \big\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} \kappa_\sigma(|\tilde{k}|) \\ &= 2 \lim_{x\to 0} x^{-\sigma} w_{2,0}[\underline{X};K,\tilde{K}]\Big|_{K=(xn,\lambda)} \\ &= 2 \lim_{x\to 0} x^{-\sigma} w_{1,1}[\underline{X};K,\tilde{K}]\Big|_{K=(xn,\lambda)} . \end{aligned} \tag{11.16}$$

The case for $w_{0,1}$ is completely analogous. This establishes that the generalized Wick kernels of $H(p,\sigma)$ satsify the soft photon sum rules $\mathbf{SR}[1]$.

11.1.3. *Basic estimates.* From (11.11) $\sim$ (11.13), one can straightforwardly read off the following estimates. For $M+N=1$, one obtains

$$\big| w_{M,N}[\underline{X};K] \big| \;\leq\; g(|p|+|X|)\kappa_\sigma(|k|) \tag{11.17}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \big|\partial_{X_0} w_{M,N}[\underline{X};K]\big| \, , \, \big|\partial_X^2 w_{M,N}[\underline{X};K]\big| &= 0 \\ \big|\partial_{|p|} w_{M,N}[\underline{X};K]\big| &\leq cg\kappa_\sigma(|k|) \\ \big|\partial_X w_{M,N}[\underline{X};K]\big| &\leq cg\kappa_\sigma(|k|) \\ \big| |k|^\sigma \partial_{|k|} \big(|k|^{-\sigma} w_{M,N}[\underline{X};K] \big) \big| &\leq cg \, . \end{aligned} \tag{11.18}$$

For $M+N=2$, one gets

$$\big| w_{M,N}[\underline{X};K,\tilde{K}] \big| \;\leq\; g^2 \kappa_\sigma(|k|)\kappa_\sigma(|\tilde{k}|) \tag{11.19}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \big|\partial_{|p|} w_{M,N}[\underline{X};K]\big| &= 0 \\ \big|\partial_{\underline{X}} w_{M,N}[\underline{X};K,\tilde{K}]\big| \, , \, \big|\partial_X^2 w_{M,N}[\underline{X};K,\tilde{K}]\big| &= 0 \\ \big| |k|^\sigma \partial_{|k|} \big(|k|^{-\sigma} w_{M,N}[\underline{X};K,\tilde{K}] \big) \big| &\leq cg \\ \big| |\tilde{k}|^\sigma \partial_{|\tilde{k}|} \big(|\tilde{k}|^{-\sigma} w_{M,N}[\underline{X};K,\tilde{K}] \big) \big| &\leq cg \, . \end{aligned} \tag{11.20}$$

We shall divide the rest of the proof into similar segments as in Section 6.6.

11.2. Proof of Theorem 11.1: Domain of $F_{\chi_1[H_f]}$.

We shall first verify that for g and $|\zeta|$ small, $(T[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + W + \zeta, H_f)$ lies in the domain of the smooth Feshbach map.

Lemma 11.2. *(Domain of the smooth Feshbach map) For sufficiently small electron charge g and $\zeta \in D_{\frac{1}{9}}$,*

$$(T[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + W + \zeta \, , \, H_f) \in \mathfrak{FP}(\mathcal{F}, \chi_1[H_f]) \tag{11.21}$$

is a Feshbach pair corresponding to $\chi_1[H_f]$.

Proof. The task is to verify properties (4.3) that define Feshbach pairs.

To this end, let P_1 denote the orthoprojector onto $\mathrm{Ran}(\chi_1[H_f]) = \mathcal{H}_{red} = \mathbf{1}[H_f < 1]\mathcal{F}$, and let $\bar{P}_1$ be its complementary projection. According to the definition given in (5.1),

$$\bar{P}_1 = \mathbf{1}[H_f > \frac{3}{4}] \, . \tag{11.22}$$

We introduce the free resolvent

$$\bar{R}_0 := \Big[H_f + \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] \big(T'[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + \zeta \big) \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] \Big]^{-1} \tag{11.23}$$

on $\mathrm{Ran}(\bar{P}_1)$, where $T'[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] := T[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] - H_f = -|p| P_f^{\|} + \frac{P_f^2}{2}$. $\bar{R}_0$ is well-defined since H_f is invertible on $\mathrm{Ran}(\bar{P}_1)$, and

$$|\bar{R}_0| \leq c \bar{P}_1 \big[H_f + P_f^2 \big]^{-1} \bar{P}_1 \, . \tag{11.24}$$

We shall first verify that

$$\big\| |\bar{R}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] W \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] |\bar{R}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} \big\|_{op} \leq cg \tag{11.25}$$

and

$$\big\| |\bar{R}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] W \chi_1[H_f] \big\|_{op} \leq cg \, . \tag{11.26}$$

To this end, we estimate the contributions from $W = \sum_{M+N=1,2} W_{M,N}$ separately.

For $M + N = 1$, the Schwarz inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} \big\| |\bar{R}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] W_{0,1} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] |\bar{R}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} \phi \big\| &\leq g \big\| |\bar{R}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} (|p| + |P_f|) \big\|_{op} \big\| A^-_{\kappa_\sigma} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] |\bar{R}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} \phi \big\| \\ &\leq cg \int dK |k|^{-1} \kappa_\sigma(|k|) \big\| a(K) \phi' \big\| \\ &\leq cg \Big[\int d^3k |k|^{-2} \kappa_\sigma^2(|k|) \Big]^{\frac{1}{2}} \| H_f^{\frac{1}{2}} \phi' \| \\ &\leq cg \| H_f^{\frac{1}{2}} |\bar{R}_0| \phi \| \\ &\leq cg \|\phi\| \, , \end{aligned} \tag{11.27}$$

for arbitrary $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\phi' := |\bar{R}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} \phi$. Here, $A^-_{\kappa_\sigma}$ denotes the term in the quantized electromagnetic vector potential A_{κ_σ} that contains annihilation operators. The case for $W_{1,0}$ is analogous.

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \big\| |\bar{R}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] W_{0,1} \chi_1[H_f]\phi \big\| \;&\leq\; cg \int dK |k|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \kappa_\sigma(|k|) \big\| a(K) \chi_1[H_f]\phi \\ &\quad \times \Big\| (|p| + |P_f|) \Big[H_f - |\zeta| - |p| P_f^{\|} + \frac{P_f^2}{2} \Big] \Big|^{-\frac{1}{2}}_{\mathrm{Ran}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] \Big\|_{op} \\ &\leq\; cg \Big[\int_{|k|<1} d^3k |k|^{-2} \kappa_\sigma^2(|k|) \Big]^{\frac{1}{2}} \big\| H_f^{\frac{1}{2}} \chi_1[H_f]\phi \big\| \\ &\leq\; cg \|\phi\| \end{aligned} \tag{11.28}$$

for arbitrary $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$. The case for $W_{1,0}$ is analogous.

For $M + N = 2$, one obtains

$$\big\| |\bar{R}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] W_{M,N} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] |\bar{R}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} \big\|_{op} \;\leq\; cg^2 \tag{11.29}$$

and

$$\big\| |\bar{R}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] W_{M,N} \chi_1[H_f] \big\|_{op} \;\leq\; cg^2 \,. \tag{11.30}$$

The proof can be straightforwardly adapted from [3].

This establishes (11.25) and (11.26).

Let

$$\bar{R} := \Big[H_f + \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] \big(T'[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + W + \zeta \big) \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] \Big]^{-1} \tag{11.31}$$

on $\mathrm{Ran}(\bar{P}_1)$. Applying a resolvent expansion in powers of W, and using the estimates (11.25), (11.26), one finds for g sufficiently small

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{R}\|_{op} \;&<\; \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} \big\| |\bar{R}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} \big\|_{op} \big\| |\bar{R}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} W |\bar{R}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} \big\|_{op}^{L} \big\| |\bar{R}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} \big\|_{op} \\ &<\; c \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} (cg)^L \;<\; c \end{aligned} \tag{11.32}$$

and similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} &\big\| |\bar{R}|^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] (T'[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + W + \zeta) \chi_1[H_f] \big\|_{op}^2 \\ &\quad = \; \big\| \chi_1[H_f] (T'[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + W + \zeta) \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad \times \bar{R} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] (T'[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + W + \zeta) \chi_1[H_f] \big\|_{op} \\ &\quad \leq \; \big\| |\bar{R}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] (T'[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + W + \zeta) \chi_1[H_f] \big\|_{op}^2 \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} \big\| |\bar{R}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} W |\bar{R}_0|^{\frac{1}{2}} \big\|_{op}^{L} \\ &\quad < \; c \,. \end{aligned} \tag{11.33}$$

We note that $(T' + \zeta)\chi_1[H_f] = \chi_1[H_f](T' + \zeta)$ is bounded.

By (4.3), this establishes the assertion of the lemma. □

11.3. **Proof of Theorem 11.1: Generalized Wick ordering.** Application of the smooth Feshbach map yields

$$F_{\chi_1[H_f]}(T[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + W + \zeta\,,\, H_f)\ , \tag{11.34}$$

which, by Lemma 11.2, restricts to a bounded operator on $\mathrm{Ran}(\chi_1[H_f])$. The corresponding intertwining operators are given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\chi_1[H_f]}(T[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + W + \zeta\,,\, H_f) &\in \mathcal{B}(\mathrm{Ran}(\chi_1[H_f]) \to \mathcal{F}) \\ Q^\sharp_{\chi_1[H_f]}(T[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + W + \zeta\,,\, H_f) &\in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F} \to \mathrm{Ran}(\chi_1[H_f]))\ , \end{aligned} \tag{11.35}$$

see (4.5), (4.6), and (4.7).

Our next goal is to prove that there exist $\epsilon_0, \delta_0 = O(g)$, and $\underline{w}^{(0)} \in \mathfrak{D}(\epsilon_0, \delta_0, \frac{1}{2})$ such that

$$H[\underline{w}^{(0)}] = F_{\chi_1[H_f]}(T[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + W + \zeta\,,\, H_f)\ . \tag{11.36}$$

The first step is to prove an analogue of the statement of Theorems 6.3 and 6.4. That is, we determine the entries of $\underline{w}^{(0)}[z]$ as integrals of formal power series with respect to the generalized Wick kernels $w_{M,N}$ in (11.11) $\sim$ (11.13). The result is given in (11.43) below. (11.43) is obtained by Neumann series expansion of $F_{\chi_1[H_f]}(T[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + W + \zeta, H_f)$ with respect to the operator W, and Wick ordering. These operations are purely algebraic, and the proofs of Theorems 6.3 and 6.4 apply to the present case with with trivial modifications, where $\chi_\rho[H_f]$ is replaced by $\chi_1[H_f]$.

To prove the convergence of (11.43), we adapt the proof of Theorem 6.6. The necessary modifications are due to the fact that the operators T and W are unbounded, in contrast to the cases studied in Section 6.6.

We closely follow our discussion in Section 6.6, and suitably modify the elements of the proof of Theorem 6.6 from Section 7 $\sim$ Section 9 step by step.

We first adapt Lemma 7.1 in Section 7, which governs the Wick ordering operation, to the first Feshbach decimation step.

Recalling

$$T'[\underline{X}] = T[\underline{X}] - X_0 = -|p|X^\parallel + \frac{1}{2}X^2 \tag{11.37}$$

and the definition of the operators $W^{m,n}_{p,q}[\underline{X}; K^{(m+p,n+q)}]$ from (6.25), and of $\tilde{W}_\ell$ from Theorem 6.3.

For fixed $L \in \mathbb{N}$, we recall that

$$\underline{m,p,n,q} := (m_1, p_1, n_1, q_1, \dots, m_L, p_L, n_L, q_L) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{4L} \tag{11.38}$$

and

$$M = m_1 + \cdots + m_L \quad , \quad N = n_1 + \cdots + n_L\ . \tag{11.39}$$

We let, for $1 \leq m_\ell + p_\ell + n_\ell + q_\ell \leq 2$,

$$V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}] \tag{11.40}$$
$$:= \Big\langle \Omega \,,\, F_0[\underline{X}] \Big[\prod_{\ell=1}^{L} \tilde{W}_\ell[z; \rho(\underline{X} + \underline{X}_\ell); \rho K_\ell^{(m_\ell, n_\ell)}] F_\ell[\underline{X}] \Big] \, \Omega \Big\rangle \,,$$

where

$$F_0[\underline{X}] := \Upsilon_{\chi_1}[z; \underline{\mathcal{P}} + \underline{X} + \underline{\tilde{X}}_0] \ , \ \ F_L[\underline{X}] := \Upsilon_{\chi_1}[z; \underline{\mathcal{P}} + \underline{X} + \underline{\tilde{X}}_L] \tag{11.41}$$

and

$$F_\ell[\underline{X}] := \frac{\bar{\chi}_1^2[H_f + X_0 + \tilde{X}_{\ell,0}]}{H_f + X_0 + \tilde{X}_{\ell,0} + \bar{\chi}_1^2[H_f]\big(T'[z; \underline{\mathcal{P}} + \underline{X} + \underline{\tilde{X}}_\ell] + E[z]\big)} \tag{11.42}$$

for $\ell = 1, \dots, L-1$.

Then,

$$\widehat{w}_{M,N}[\zeta; \underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}] \;=\; \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{L-1} \sum_{\substack{m_1 + \cdots + m_L = M \\ n_1 + \cdots + n_L = N}} \; \sum_{\substack{p_1, q_1, \dots, p_L, q_L : \\ 1 \leq m_\ell + p_\ell + n_\ell + q_\ell \leq 2}}$$
$$\times \prod_{\ell=1}^{L} \Big\{ \binom{m_\ell + p_\ell}{p_\ell} \binom{n_\ell + q_\ell}{q_\ell} \Big\} V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}] \,. \tag{11.43}$$

We claim that the statement of Lemma 7.1 also holds for the definition of F_ℓ, $W_{M,N}$, and $V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}]$ given here, but with ρ replaced by 1.

Lemma 11.3. *For any $L \geq 1$ and $\underline{m,p,n,q} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{4L}$, one has $V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}} \in \mathfrak{W}^\sharp_{M,N}$ with*

$$\max\Big\{ \| \partial_{X_0} V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}} \|_\sigma \quad , \quad \| |k|^\sigma \partial_{|k|} \big(|k|^{-\sigma} V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}} \big) \|_\sigma \Big\}$$
$$\leq \; 2(L+1) C_\Theta^{L+1} \prod_{l=1}^{L} \frac{\| w_{m_l + p_l, n_l + q_l}[z] \|^\sharp_\sigma}{p_l^{p_l/2} q_l^{q_l/2}} \,, \tag{11.44}$$

for any $k \in k^{(M,N)}$. Furthermore,

$$\| \partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}} \|_\sigma \;\leq\; 10(L+1)^2 C_\Theta^{L+2} \prod_{l=1}^{L} \frac{\| w_{m_l + p_l, n_l + q_l}[z] \|^\sharp_\sigma}{p_l^{p_l/2} q_l^{q_l/2}} \,, \tag{11.45}$$

for $0 \leq |\underline{a}| \leq 2$, $a_0 = 0$. For $|p| > 0$, and $|\underline{a}| \leq 1$,

$$\| \partial_{|p|} \partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}} \|_\sigma \;\leq\; 10(L+1)^2 C_\Theta^{L+2} \prod_{l=1}^{L} \frac{\| w_{m_l + p_l, n_l + q_l}[z] \|^\sharp_\sigma}{p_l^{p_l/2} q_l^{q_l/2}} \,. \tag{11.46}$$

Consequently,

$$\| V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}} \|^\sharp_\sigma \;\leq\; 10(L+1)^2 C_\Theta^{L+2} \prod_{l=1}^{L} \frac{\| w_{m_l + p_l, n_l + q_l}[z] \|^\sharp_\sigma}{p_l^{p_l/2} q_l^{q_l/2}} \,, \tag{11.47}$$

using the convention $p^p = 1$ for $p = 0$. The constant C_Θ only depends on the choice of the smooth cutoff function χ_1.

Proof. We follow the proof of Lemma 7.1 step by step, and replace arguments wherever necessary.

First of all, one can straightforwardly verify that there is a constant $1 \le C_\Theta < \infty$ that only depends on the choice of the smooth cutoff function Θ (used in the definition of $\chi_1[H_f]$, see (5.1)) such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_{X_0} F_\ell[\underline{X}]| \quad &+ \sum_{\substack{0\le|\underline{a}|\le 2\\ a_0=0}} |\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} F_\ell[\underline{X}]| + \sum_{|\underline{a}|\le 1} |\partial_{|p|}\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} F_\ell[\underline{X}]| \\ &\le \quad \frac{C_\Theta}{H_f+X_0+(P_f+X)^2}\mathbf{1}\Big[|X|\le X_0 \big| H_f+X_0\ge \frac{3}{4}\Big] \ , \end{aligned} \tag{11.48}$$

uniformly in $z \in D_{\frac{1}{10}}$. The characteristic function on the right hand side accommodates the fact that $|P_f| \le H_f$, and $\mathrm{supp}(\bar\chi_1) = [\frac{3}{4}, \infty)$.

Next, we bound $|V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}]|$. The operator norm estimates in (7.13) cannot be applied here, because the interaction operators $\tilde W_\ell$ are not bounded on $\mathrm{Ran}(\bar\chi_1[H_f]) \subset \mathcal{F}$. However, with

$$\begin{aligned} |V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}]| \quad &\le \quad \Big\| \, |F_0[\underline{X}_0]|^{\frac12} \Big\|_{op} \Big\| \, |F_L[\underline{X}_L]|^{\frac12} \Big\|_{op} \\ &\times \quad \prod_{\ell=1}^{L} \Big\| |F_{\ell-1}[\underline{X}_{\ell-1}]|^{\frac12} \tilde W_\ell[z; \underline{X} + \underline{X}_\ell; K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] |F_\ell[\underline{X}_\ell]|^{\frac12} \Big\|_{op} \end{aligned} \tag{11.49}$$

we may use (11.48) together with the relative norm bounds

$$\Big\| |F_{\ell-1}[\underline{X}_{\ell-1}]|^{\frac12} \tilde W_\ell[z; \underline{X} + \underline{X}_\ell; K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] |F_\ell[\underline{X}_\ell]|^{\frac12} \Big\|_{op} \le cg \ ,$$

for $\ell = 1, \dots, L$. The proof of the latter is a straightforward adaptation of the arguments used to prove (11.29), (11.30), (11.27), and (11.28).

To estimate $|\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}[\underline{X}; K^{(M,N)}]|$, for $1 \le |\underline{a}| \le 2$ with $a_0 \in \{0, 1\}$, we use (11.17), (11.18), (11.19), (11.19), and (11.48), finding

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big\| |\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} F_{\ell-1}[\underline{X}_{\ell-1}]|^{\frac12} \tilde W_\ell[z; \underline{X} + \underline{X}_\ell; K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] |F_\ell[\underline{X}_\ell]|^{\frac12} \Big\|_{op} \quad , \\ &\Big\| |F_{\ell-1}[\underline{X}_{\ell-1}]|^{\frac12} \partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}} \tilde W_\ell[z; \underline{X} + \underline{X}_\ell; K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] |F_\ell[\underline{X}_\ell]|^{\frac12} \Big\|_{op} \quad \le \quad cg \ , \end{aligned}$$

etc., as well as

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big\| |\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}_1} F_{\ell-1}[\underline{X}_{\ell-1}]|^{\frac12} \tilde W_\ell[z; \underline{X} + \underline{X}_\ell; K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] |\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}_2} F_\ell[\underline{X}_\ell]|^{\frac12} \Big\|_{op} \quad , \\ &\Big\| |\partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}_1} F_{\ell-1}[\underline{X}_{\ell-1}]|^{\frac12} \partial_{\underline{X}}^{\underline{a}_2} \tilde W_\ell[z; \underline{X} + \underline{X}_\ell; K_\ell^{(m_\ell,n_\ell)}] |F_\ell[\underline{X}_\ell]|^{\frac12} \Big\|_{op} \quad \le \quad cg \ , \end{aligned}$$

etc., for $\underline{a}_1 + \underline{a}_2 = \underline{a}$, and $\ell = 1, \dots, L$.

We estimate derivatives of $V^{(L)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}$ by separately bounding the terms $V^{(L,j)}_{\underline{m,p,n,q}}$, $j = i, ii, \dots, viii$, introduced in the proof of Lemma 7.1 in Section 7. Only now, we use the relative norm bounds derived above, and replace ρ by 1. Then, the statement of Lemma 7.1 can straightforwardly be verified to hold also for the present case. $\square$

11.4. **Proof of Theorem 11.1: Mapping into a polydisc.**

Lemma 11.4. *For g sufficiently small and under the assumptions of Theorem 11.1, there are small, positive constants* $\epsilon_0, \delta_0 = O(g)$*, and* ξ*, such that*

$$H[\underline{w}^{(0)}] = F_{\chi_1[H_f]}(T[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + W + \zeta\,,\,H_f) \tag{11.50}$$

for an element $\underline{w}^{(0)}$ *contained in the polydisc* $\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon_0, \delta_0, \frac{1}{2})$*, which is endowed with the norm* $\|\cdot\|_{\xi,\sigma}$*.*

Proof. We may here adapt the segment of the proof of Theorem 6.6 presented in Section 9 line by line. The only difference here again is that ρ is replaced by 1 in all estimates.

We note that a detailed account on this part of the discussion for a similar model can be found in [3]. □

11.5. **Proof of Theorem 11.1: Soft photon sum rules.**

Lemma 11.5. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 11.1,* $\underline{w}^{(0)} \in \mathfrak{D}(\epsilon_0, \delta_0, \frac{1}{2})$ *satisfies the soft photon sum rules* **SR**[1].

Proof. Again, we can straightforwardly adapt the arguments presented in Section 8 line by line to the present case. The algebraic structure of $\underline{V^{(L)}_{m,p,n,q}}$ is equal to that of the corresponding terms discussed there, while ρ is replaced by 1. One then concludes that $\underline{w}^{(0)}$ satisfies the soft photon sum rules **SR**[1], for the value $\mu = 1$ in (6.30) (the value of μ depends on the normalization condition (1.15)). □

12. RECONSTRUCTION OF THE GROUND STATE EIGENVALUE AND EIGENVECTOR

In this section, we prove that the infimum of the spectrum of $H(p, \sigma)$ is a simple eigenvalue at the bottom of essential spectrum, and to construct the corresponding ground state eigenvector.

The strategy is based on combining the isospectral renormalization group from Sections 5, 6 and 6.6 with recursive applications of the reconstruction part of the Feshbach theorem, Theorem 4.2.

Theorem 12.1. *If* $0 < |p| < \frac{1}{3}$*, assume for* $\sigma > 0$ *that* $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\sigma)$*,* $\rho = \rho(\sigma)$*,* ξ*,* $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(\sigma) > 0$ *are sufficiently small such that the renormalization map* $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ *has the codimension 2 contractivity property (6.32) on* $\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon_0, \delta_0 + 2\epsilon_0, 1/2)$*, endowed with the norm* $\|\cdot\|_{\xi,\sigma}$*. If* $p = 0$*, assume that independently of* $\sigma \geq 0$*,* ρ*,* ξ*,* ϵ_0*,* δ_0 *are sufficiently small such that the latter holds.*

Suppose that the electron charge g is sufficiently small that $\underline{w}^{(0)} \in \mathfrak{D}(\epsilon_0, \delta_0, \frac{1}{2})$*.*

Then, with $e_{(0,\infty)} \in D_{\frac{1}{10}}$ *defined in (12.9) below,* $H[\underline{w}^{(0)}[e_{(0,\infty)}]]$ *has a simple ground state eigenvalue at* 0*, with eigenvector* $\Psi_{(0,\infty)}$ *given in (12.50).*

Moreover, $E(p, \sigma)$*, as defined in (12.13), is the simple ground state eigenvalue of* $H(p, \sigma)$*, and the corresponding eigenvector is given by* $\Psi_{(-1,\infty)}$*, as defined in (12.56).*

Proof. We recall from Section 6.6 that $\mathfrak{D}^{(\mu)}(\epsilon,\delta,\lambda) \subset \underline{\mathfrak{W}}_{\geq 0}$ denotes the subset of elements of $\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon,\delta,\lambda)$ satisfying the soft photon sum rules $\mathbf{SR}[\mu]$. By Lemma 11.5 and Theorem 6.6, we have

$$\mathcal{R}_\rho : \mathfrak{D}^{(1)}(\epsilon_0,\delta_0,2^{-1}) \quad \to \quad \mathfrak{D}^{(\rho^\sigma)}(2^{-1}\epsilon_0,\delta_0+\epsilon_0,2^{-1}\rho) \; ,$$

so that

$$\mathcal{R}_\rho^n : \mathfrak{D}^{(1)}(\epsilon_0,\delta_0,2^{-1}) \to \mathfrak{D}^{(\rho^{n\sigma})}(\epsilon_n,\delta_n,\lambda_n) \; ,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_n &\leq 2^{-n}\epsilon_0 \\ \delta_n &\leq \delta_0 + [1+2^{-1}+\cdots+2^{-n+1}]\epsilon_0 \leq \delta_0 + 2\epsilon_0 \\ \lambda_n &= \frac{\rho^n}{2} \; . \end{aligned} \tag{12.1}$$

It hence follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{w}^{(n)} &:= \mathcal{R}_\rho^n[\underline{w}^{(0)}] \\ &\in \mathfrak{D}^{(\rho^{n\sigma})}(\epsilon_n,\delta_n,\lambda_n) \end{aligned} \tag{12.2}$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Let now

$$E_{(n)}[z] := w_{0,0}^{(n)}[z;\underline{0}] \; , \tag{12.3}$$

and

$$\mathcal{U}_{(n)} := \mathcal{U}[\underline{w}^{(n)}] = \Big\{ z \in D_{\frac{1}{10}} \Big| |E_{(n)}[z]| \leq \frac{\rho}{10} \Big\} \; . \tag{12.4}$$

From Lemma 6.1, we recall that

$$J_{(n)} : \mathcal{U}_{(n)} \to D_{\frac{1}{10}} \quad , \quad z \mapsto \rho^{-1}E_{(n)}[z] \; , \tag{12.5}$$

is an analytic bijection. which satisfies

$$\frac{\rho}{20}|\zeta-\zeta'| \leq |J_{(n)}^{-1}[\zeta] - J_{(n)}^{-1}[\zeta']| \leq \frac{3\rho}{20}|\zeta-\zeta'| \; , \tag{12.6}$$

cf. [1].

We then define, for $0 \leq n \leq m$,

$$e_{(n,m)} := J_{(n)}^{-1} \circ \cdots \circ J_{(m)}^{-1}[0] \; . \tag{12.7}$$

By (12.6),

$$|e_{(n,m)} - e_{(n,m+1)}| \leq \Big(\frac{3\rho}{20}\Big)^{m-n} |e_{(m,m)} - e_{(m,m+1)}| \leq \Big(\frac{3\rho}{20}\Big)^{m-n} \; , \tag{12.8}$$

since $e_{m,m}, e_{m,m+1} \in D_{\frac{1}{10}}$, [1]. As $\frac{3\rho}{20} < 1$, the limit

$$e_{(n,\infty)} := \lim_{m\to\infty} e_{(n,m)} \in \mathcal{U}_{(n)} \tag{12.9}$$

exists for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and by construction,

$$\rho^{-1}E_{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}] = J_{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}] = e_{(n+1,\infty)} \; . \tag{12.10}$$

This, together with $|E_{(n)}[z] - z| \leq 2^{-n}\epsilon_0$, implies that

$$|e_{(n,\infty)} - \rho e_{(n+1,\infty)}| = |e_{(n,\infty)} - E_{(n)}[e_{(\alpha,\infty)}]| \leq 2^{-n}\epsilon_0 \; , \tag{12.11}$$

and consequently,

$$|e_{(n,\infty)}| \leq 2^{-n+1}\epsilon_0 \tag{12.12}$$

tends to zero in the limit $n \to \infty$.

Next, we let

$$\begin{aligned} e_{(-1,\infty)} &:= J_{(-1)}^{-1}[e_{(0,\infty)}] \,, \\ E(p,\sigma) &:= e_{(-1,\infty)} + \frac{p^2}{2} + \frac{g^2}{2}\big\langle \Omega, A_{\kappa_\sigma}^2 \Omega \big\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{12.13}$$

and

$$H_{(-1)} := e_{(-1,\infty)}\mathbf{1} + T_{(-1)} + W_{(-1)} \tag{12.14}$$

on $\mathcal{F}$, where

$$T_{(-1)} = H_f - |p| P_f^{\|} + P_f^2 \tag{12.15}$$

$$W_{(-1)} = g\big\langle (p - P_f), A_{\kappa_\sigma} \big\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} + \frac{g^2}{2} : A_{\kappa_\sigma}^2 : \,. \tag{12.16}$$

Then,

$$H_{(-1)} = H(p,\sigma) - E(p,\sigma) \,, \tag{12.17}$$

where $H(p,\sigma)$ is the fiber Hamiltonian, see (1.19) and (11.5).

Moreover, we introduce the notation

$$\begin{aligned} H_{(n)} &:= H[\underline{w}^{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}]] \\ &= T_{(n)} + e_{(n,\infty)}\chi_1^2[H_f] + W_{(n)} \end{aligned} \tag{12.18}$$

for $n \geq 0$, where

$$T_{(n)} = w_{0,0}^{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}; \underline{\mathcal{P}}] - w_{0,0}^{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}; \underline{0}] \,, \tag{12.19}$$

and

$$W_{(n)} = \sum_{M+N \geq 1} \chi_1[H_f] W_{M,N}[w_{M,N}^{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}]] \chi_1[H_f] \,. \tag{12.20}$$

Since by construction (12.10) is satisfied, we have for $n \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} H_{(n)} &= S_\rho\big[F_{\chi_\rho}\big(H_{(n-1)}, H_f\big)\big] \\ &= R_\rho^H[H_{(n-1)}] \\ &= (R_\rho^H)^n[H_{(0)}] \,, \end{aligned} \tag{12.21}$$

and

$$H_{(0)} = F_{\chi_1[H_1]}(H(p,\sigma) - E(p,\sigma), H_f) \,. \tag{12.22}$$

$H_{(0)}$ has been constructed in the first decimation step.

We shall now demonstrate that for $\sigma > 0$ and $0 \leq |p| < \frac{1}{3}$,

$$E(p,\sigma) = \inf \operatorname{spec}\{H(p,\sigma)\} \,. \tag{12.23}$$

Furthermore, we shall prove that $E(p,\sigma)$ is a non-degenerate eigenvalue, and construct the corresponding eigenvector.

Let

$$Q_{(-1)} \;:=\; Q_{\chi_1[H_f]}\big(H_{(-1)}, H_f\big)\ , \tag{12.24}$$

which is a map $\mathrm{Ran}(\chi_1[H_f]) \to \mathcal{F}$, and for $n \geq 0$,

$$Q_{(n)} \;:=\; Q_{\chi_\rho[H_f]}\big(H_{(n)}, H_f\big)\ , \tag{12.25}$$

which is a map $\mathrm{Ran}(\chi_\rho) \to \mathcal{H}_{red}$. Let Γ_ρ denote the unitary dilatation operator, defined by $\Gamma_\rho\Omega = \Omega$, so that $S_\rho = \frac{1}{\rho}\Gamma_\rho(\,\cdot\,)\Gamma_\rho^*$, see (6.1). Then, the first equation in (4.10), Eq. (12.21), and $S_\rho[\chi_\rho[H_f]] = \frac{1}{\rho}\chi_1[H_f]$ together imply the key *intertwining property*

$$H_{(-1)}Q_{(-1)} = \chi_1[H_f]H_{(0)}\ , \tag{12.26}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H_{(n-1)}Q_{(n-1)}\Gamma_\rho^* &= \chi_\rho[H_f]F_{\chi_\rho[H_f]}(H_{(n-1)}, H_f)\Gamma_\rho^* \\ &= \rho\chi_\rho[H_f]\Gamma_\rho^* H_{(n)} \\ &= \rho\Gamma_\rho^*\chi_1[H_f]H_{(n)} \end{aligned} \tag{12.27}$$

for $n \geq 0$.

Next, we define vectors

$$\Psi_{(n,m)} := Q_{(n)}\Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(n+1)}\Gamma_\rho^* \cdots Q_{(m-1)}\Omega \;\in\; \mathcal{H}_{red}\ , \tag{12.28}$$

for $0 \leq n < m$. In the case $n = -1$,

$$\Psi_{(-1,m)} = Q_{(-1)}\Psi_{(0,m)} \tag{12.29}$$

is an element not of $\mathcal{H}_{red} = \mathbf{1}[H_f < 1]\mathcal{F}$, but of $\mathcal{F}$.

Noting that $\Omega = \Gamma_\rho^*\chi_\rho[H_f]\Omega$,

$$\Psi_{(n,m+1)} - \Psi_{(n,m)} = Q_{(n)}\Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(n+1)}\Gamma_\rho^* \cdots Q_{(m-1)}\Gamma_\rho^*(Q_{(m)} - \chi_\rho[H_f])\Omega\ . \tag{12.30}$$

We shall next estimate (12.30). The discussion here is more complicated than in [1], due to overlap terms of the form $T'_{(j)}[\underline{P}]\chi_\rho[H_f]\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]$, which can be large (cf. Section 4.5), where $T'_{(j)}$ is defined in (12.34).

Lemma 12.2. *Let $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then,*

$$\|(Q_{(j)} - \chi_\rho[H_f])\Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(j+1)}\|_{op} \leq c\,\frac{2^{-j}\epsilon_0}{\rho^3}\ . \tag{12.31}$$

Proof. Writing out (12.25),

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{(j)} \;=\; & \chi_\rho[H_f] - \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\bar{R}_{(j)}\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f] \\ & \Big(T'_{(j)} + e_{(j,\infty)}\chi_1^2[H_f] + W_{(j)}\Big)\chi_\rho[H_f]\ , \end{aligned} \tag{12.32}$$

for $j \geq 0$, where

$$\bar{R}_{(j)} \;:=\; \Big[H_f + \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\Big(T'_{(j)} + e_{(j,\infty)}\chi_1^2[H_f] + W_{(j)}\Big)\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\Big]^{-1} \tag{12.33}$$

on $\mathrm{Ran}(\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f])$, and

$$T'_{(j)} = T_{(j)} - H_f\ . \tag{12.34}$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}_{(j)} &:= \chi_\rho[H_f] - \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\bar{R}_{(j)}\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]W_{(j)}\chi_\rho[H_f] \\ \bar{Q}_{(j)} &:= \chi_\rho[H_f] - \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\bar{R}_{(j)}\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\Big(T'_{(j)} + e_{(j,\infty)}\Big)\chi_\rho[H_f] \; . \end{aligned} \tag{12.35}$$

We note that

$$Q_{(m)}\Omega = \tilde{Q}_{(m)}\Omega \; , \tag{12.36}$$

since $T'_{(m)}$ and $e_{(m,\infty)}$ commute with $\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]$, and $\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\Omega = 0$.

The first term on the right hand side of

$$\begin{aligned} (Q_{(j)} - \chi_\rho[H_f])\Gamma^*_\rho Q_{(j+1)} &= (\tilde{Q}_{(j)} - \chi_\rho[H_f])\Gamma^*_\rho Q_{(j+1)} \\ &+ (\bar{Q}_{(j)} - \chi_\rho[H_f])\Gamma^*_\rho Q_{(j+1)} \end{aligned} \tag{12.37}$$

is in operator norm bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\tilde{Q}_{(j)} - \chi_\rho[H_f])\Gamma^*_\rho Q_{(j+1)}\|_{op} &\leq \|\tilde{Q}_{(j)} - \chi_\rho[H_f]\|_{op}\|Q_{(j+1)}\|_{op} \\ &\leq \|\bar{R}_{(j)}\|_{op}\|W_{(j)}\|_{op}\|\bar{R}_{(j)}\|_{op}\|H_{(j+1)} - H_f\|_{op} \\ &\leq c\,\frac{2^{-j}\epsilon_j}{\rho^2} \; , \end{aligned} \tag{12.38}$$

where we used the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big\|\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\Big(H_f + \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f](T'_{(j)}[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + e_{(j,\infty)}\chi_1^2[H_f] + W_{(j)})\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\Big)^{-1}\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\Big\|_{op} \\ &\leq (c\rho - \|W_{(j)}\|_{op})^{-1} \; , \end{aligned} \tag{12.39}$$

cf. the proof of Proposition 6.2, and

$$\|W_{(j)}\|_{op} \leq 2^{-j}\epsilon_0 \; , \tag{12.40}$$

for general $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Furthermore, $\|H_{(j+1)} - H_f\|_{op} < c$, where the bound is independent of j.

The second term on the right hand side of (12.37) can be written as

$$(\bar{Q}_{(j)} - \chi_\rho[H_f])\Gamma^*_\rho Q_{(j+1)} = (I) + (II) \; , \tag{12.41}$$

where

$$(I) := (\bar{Q}_{(j)} - \chi_\rho[H_f])\Gamma^*_\rho \tilde{Q}_{(j+1)} \tag{12.42}$$

and

$$(II) := (\bar{Q}_{(j)} - \chi_\rho[H_f])\Gamma^*_\rho(\bar{Q}_{(j+1)} - \chi_\rho[H_f]) \; . \tag{12.43}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(I)\|_{op} &\leq \|\bar{Q}_{(j)} - \chi_\rho[H_f]\|_{op}\|\bar{R}_{(j+1)}\|_{op}\|W_{(j+1)}\|_{op} \\ &\leq c\,\frac{2^{-j}\epsilon_0}{\rho^2} \; , \end{aligned} \tag{12.44}$$

since

$$\|\bar{Q}_{(j)} - \chi_\rho[H_f]\|_{op} \leq \|\bar{R}_{(j)}\|_{op}\|T'_{(j)} + e_{(j,\infty)}\|_{op} \leq \frac{c}{\rho} \; , \tag{12.45}$$

where $\|T'_{(j)} + e_{(j,\infty)}\|_{op} < c$, independently of j. Furthermore, by expanding the resolvent $\bar{R}_{(j)}$ once (with $\bar{R}_{0,(j+1)}$ corresponding to $\bar{R}_{(j)}$ with $W_{(j)}$ set equal to zero),

$$\begin{aligned}(II) &= (\bar{Q}_{(j)} - \chi_\rho[H_f])\Gamma_\rho^* \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\bar{R}_{0,(j+1)}\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f](T'_{(j+1)} + e_{(j+1,\infty)})\chi_\rho[H_f] \\ &- (\bar{Q}_{(j)} - \chi_\rho[H_f])\Gamma_\rho^* \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\bar{R}_{0,(j+1)}\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]W_{(j+1)}(\bar{Q}_{(j+1)} - \chi_\rho[H_f]) \, .\end{aligned}$$

The first product of operators on the right hand side of the equality sign is identically zero, as one easily sees by commuting the cutoff operator $\chi_\rho[H_f]$ to the left, and by noting that

$$(\bar{Q}_{(j)} - \chi_\rho[H_f])\Gamma_\rho^*\chi_\rho[H_f] = (\bar{Q}_{(j)} - \chi_\rho[H_f])\chi_{\rho^2}[H_f]\Gamma_\rho^* = 0 \, , \tag{12.46}$$

since $\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\chi_{\rho^2}[H_f] = 0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\|(II)\|_{op} &\leq \|\bar{Q}_{(j)} - \chi_\rho[H_f]\|_{op}\|\bar{R}_{0,(j+1)}\|_{op}\|W_{(j+1)}\|_{op}\|\bar{Q}_{(j+1)} - \chi_\rho[H_f]\|_{op} \\ &\leq c\,\frac{2^{-j}\epsilon_0}{\rho^3} \, , \end{aligned} \tag{12.47}$$

by (12.45). This proves (12.31). ☐

Hence, we find for

$$\Psi_{(n,m)} = Q_{(n)}\Gamma_\rho^* \, Q_{(n+1)}\Gamma_\rho^* \cdots Q_{m-2}\Gamma_\rho^*\tilde{Q}_{(m-1)}\Omega \, , \tag{12.48}$$

that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Psi_{(n,m+1)} - \Psi_{(n,m)}\| &\leq \|\tilde{Q}_{(m-1)} - \chi_\rho[H_f]\|_{op} \\ &\times \prod_{k=0}^{\frac{m-n-2}{2}} \Big(1 + \|(Q_{(n+2k)} - \chi_\rho[H_f])\Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(n+2k+1)}\|_{op}\Big) \, ,\end{aligned}$$

if $m-n$ is even. The modification for $m-n$ odd is evident, and will not be elaborated on separately. Thus,

$$\|\Psi_{(n,m+1)} - \Psi_{(n,m)}\| \leq c\,2^{-m}\frac{\epsilon_0}{\rho}\exp[c'\,2^{-n}\epsilon_0\rho^{-3}] \tag{12.49}$$

for constants which are independent of ϵ_0, ρ, σ, and m, n. It thus follows that for each fixed $n \geq 0$, the sequence of vectors $\{\Psi_{(n,m)}\}_{m=0}^\infty$ in $\mathcal{H}_{red}$

$$\Psi_{(n,\infty)} := \lim_{m\to\infty}\Psi_{(n,m)} \tag{12.50}$$

exists. For $n = -1$, $\{\Psi_{(-1,m)}\}_{m=0}^\infty$ is a convergent sequence of vectors in $\mathcal{F}$. In particular,

$$\|\Psi_{(n,\infty)} - \Omega\| = \|\Psi_{(n,\infty)} - \Psi_{(n,n)}\| \leq c\,2^{-n+1}\frac{\epsilon_0}{\rho}\exp[c'\,2^{-n}\epsilon_0\rho^{-3}] \tag{12.51}$$

which implies that there is n^*, such that $\Psi_{(n,\infty)}$ is non-zero for all $n > n^*$.

For every $n \geq -1$, the vector $\Psi_{(n,\infty)}$ is an element of the kernel of $H_{(n)}$. To prove this, we use

$$\begin{aligned}H_{(n)}\Psi_{(n,m)} &= (H_{(n)}Q_{(n)}\Gamma_\rho^*)Q_{(n+1)}\Gamma_\rho^*\cdots Q_{(m-1)}\Omega \\ &= \rho\Gamma_\rho^*\chi_1[H_f](H_{(n+1)}Q_{(n+1)}\Gamma^*)Q_{n+2}\Gamma_\rho^*\cdots Q_{(m-1)}\Omega \\ &= \cdots = \rho^{m-n}(\Gamma_\rho^*\chi_1[H_f])^{m-n}H_{(m)}\Omega \, .\end{aligned} \tag{12.52}$$

Using $T_{(m)}\Omega = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi_1[H_f]H_{(m)}\Omega\| &= \|\chi_1[H_f]W_{(m)}\Omega + E_{(m)}\Omega\| \\ &\leq 2^{-m}\epsilon_0 + \rho|e_{(m+1,\infty)}| \\ &\leq 2^{-m+1}\epsilon_0 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{12.53}$$

Hence,

$$\|H_{(n)}\Psi_{(n,m)}\| \leq 2^{-m+1}\epsilon_0 \to 0 \ (m \to \infty) \ . \tag{12.54}$$

A more detailed discussion is given in [1].

By continuity of $H_{(n)}$ on $\mathcal{H}_{red}$,

$$H_{(n)}\Psi_{(n,\infty)} = \lim_{m\to\infty} H_{(n)}\Psi_{(n,m)} = 0 \ , \tag{12.55}$$

for all $n \geq 0$. This implies that $H_{(0,\infty)}\Psi_{(0,\infty)} = 0$. In particular,

$$\Psi_{(-1,\infty)} = Q_{(-1)}\Psi_{(0,\infty)} \tag{12.56}$$

satisfies

$$H_{(-1,\infty)}\Psi_{(-1,\infty)} = (H(p,\sigma) - E(p,\sigma))\Psi_{(-1,\infty)} = 0 \tag{12.57}$$

on $\mathcal{F}$. This proves the theorem. □

13. The renormalized mass at non-vanishing conserved momentum

Starting with this section, we focus on the renormalized mass of the electron, and prove the main result of this paper. The treatment of the cases $|p| > 0$ (in this section) and $p = 0$ (in Sections 14 and 15) will differ substantially.

A key input is the main result of Section 12, where we have determined

$$E(p,\sigma) = \mathrm{infspec}\{H(p,\sigma)\} \tag{13.1}$$

for $0 \leq p < \frac{1}{3}$ and $\sigma > 0$. Moreover, we established that $E(p,\sigma)$ is a simple eigenvalue, and have constructed the corresponding eigenvector

$$\Psi(p,\sigma) := \Psi_{(-1,\infty)} \in \mathcal{F} \ . \tag{13.2}$$

We will also use many of the intermediate steps and results presented in the proof of Theorem 12.1.

Our discussion is structured as follows.

In this section, we study the case $p \neq 0$, and prove bounds on

$$m_{ren}(p,\sigma) = \frac{1}{\partial^2_{|p|}E(p,\sigma)} \tag{13.3}$$

for $\sigma > 0$ and $0 < |p| < \frac{1}{3}$ which are not uniform in σ. Uniform bounds for $p \neq 0$ are beyond the scope of the present work, and addressed elsewhere, [5].

Section 14 addresses the case $p = 0$. We shall use a different definition of the renormalized mass than in the case $p \neq 0$, and refer to the corresponding quantity as $m^*_{ren}(p = 0,\sigma)$. It is determined by the ratio of the coefficients of certain operators appearing in the effective Hamiltonians that are produced by the isospectral renormalization group. Our bound on $m^*_{ren}(p = 0,\sigma)$ is *uniform* in σ.

In Section 15, we prove that for $\sigma > 0$, both definitions of the renormalized mass agree. Invoking condition (14.8), we arrive at a uniform bound on the renormalized mass at $p = 0$ in the limit $\sigma \to 0$ (for the proof of condition (14.8), cf. [5]).

Our constructive proof, based on the operator-theoretic renormalization group, provides an explicit algorithm to compute the renormalized mass to any desired precision. This is discussed in Section 16.

13.1. **The main theorem.**

We shall first address the case $|p| > 0$ and $\sigma > 0$. We prove the estimates on the derivatives of $E(p,\sigma)$ with respect to $|p|$ asserted in Theorem 2.1, which are summarized in the following theorem.

Theorem 13.1. *For $0 < |p| < \frac{1}{3}$, there exist finite constants $g_0(\sigma), c_0(\sigma) > 0$ for every $\sigma > 0$ such that for all $0 \leq g < g_0(\sigma)$,*

$$\Big| E(p,\sigma) - \frac{|p|^2}{2} - \frac{g^2}{2}\big\langle \Omega, A_{\kappa_\sigma}^2 \Omega\big\rangle \Big| \leq c_0(\sigma)\,\frac{g^2|p|^2}{2} \ . \tag{13.4}$$

Furthermore,

$$\Big| \partial_{|p|} E(p,\sigma) - |p| \Big| \leq c_0(\sigma) g^2 |p| \tag{13.5}$$

and

$$\Big| \partial_{|p|}^2 E(p,\sigma) - 1 \Big| \leq c_0(\sigma) g^2 \ . \tag{13.6}$$

In particular, $\partial_{|p|}^2 E(p,\sigma) < 1$.

Proof. To begin with, we remark that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{p\to 0} E(p,\sigma) \quad &\leq \quad \big\langle \Omega \, , \, H(0,\sigma)\Omega \big\rangle \\ &= \quad \frac{g^2}{2}\big\langle \Omega, A_{\kappa_\sigma}^2 \Omega\big\rangle \ = \ O(g^2) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{13.7}$$

uniformly in σ. Thus, (13.4) follows from (13.5).

Applying $\partial_{|p|}$ to

$$(H(p,\sigma) - E(p,\sigma))\Psi(p,\sigma) = 0 \ , \tag{13.8}$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_{|p|} H(p,\sigma) \quad &- \quad \partial_{|p|} E(p,\sigma))\Psi(p,\sigma) \\ &= \quad -(H(p,\sigma) - E(p,\sigma))\partial_{|p|}\Psi(p,\sigma) \end{aligned} \tag{13.9}$$

and taking the inner product with $\Psi(p,\sigma)$, we get the Feynman-Hellman formula

$$\partial_{|p|} E(p,\sigma) = \frac{\big\langle \Psi(p,\sigma) \, , \, (\partial_{|p|} H)(p,\sigma)\Psi(p,\sigma)\big\rangle}{\big\langle \Psi(p,\sigma) \, , \, \Psi(p,\sigma)\big\rangle} \ . \tag{13.10}$$

The second derivative of the ground state energy is given by

$$\partial_{|p|}^2 E(p,\sigma) = 1 - 2\frac{\big\langle (\partial_{|p|}\Psi)(p,\sigma) \, , \, (H(p,\sigma) - E(p,\sigma))(\partial_{|p|}\Psi)(p,\sigma)\big\rangle}{\big\langle \Psi(p,\sigma) \, , \, \Psi(p,\sigma)\big\rangle} \ . \tag{13.11}$$

Since

$$H(p,\sigma) - E(p,\sigma) \geq 0 \ , \tag{13.12}$$

(13.11) immediately implies $\partial_{|p|}^2 E(p,\sigma) < 1$.

To verify (13.11), let us momentarily suppress the arguments (p,σ), and write f' for $\partial_{|p|} f$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{|p|}^2 E(p,\sigma) &= \frac{\big\langle \Psi, H''\Psi\big\rangle + \big\langle \Psi', H'\Psi\big\rangle + \big\langle H'\Psi, \Psi'\big\rangle}{\big\langle \Psi, \Psi\big\rangle} \\ &\qquad - \big\langle \Psi, H'\Psi\big\rangle \frac{\big\langle \Psi, \Psi'\big\rangle + \big\langle \Psi', \Psi\big\rangle}{\big\langle \Psi, \Psi\big\rangle^2} \\ &= \frac{\big\langle \Psi, H''\Psi\big\rangle - 2\big\langle \Psi', (H-E)\Psi'\big\rangle}{\big\langle \Psi, \Psi\big\rangle} \\ &\qquad + \Big(E'\big\langle \Psi, \Psi\big\rangle - \big\langle \Psi, H'\Psi\big\rangle\Big) \frac{\big\langle \Psi', \Psi\big\rangle + \big\langle \Psi, \Psi'\big\rangle}{\big\langle \Psi, \Psi\big\rangle^2} \, . \end{aligned} \tag{13.13}$$

Here, we have applied $\partial_{|p|}$ to (13.10), and used

$$H'\Psi = E'\Psi - (H-E)\Psi' \tag{13.14}$$

from (13.9). The last line in (13.13) vanishes, due to (13.10), and we note that $H'' = 1$. This establishes (13.11).

To prove (13.5), we first derive an a priori bound from (13.10), which implies that $\partial_{|p|} E(p,\sigma)$ exists for every $0 \le |p| < \frac{1}{3}$, and uniformly in $\sigma > 0$. To this end, we observe that

$$H(p,\sigma) = H_f + \frac{1}{2}(\partial_{|p|} H(p,\sigma))^2 \, . \tag{13.15}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_{|p|} E(p,\sigma)| &\le \left(\frac{\big\langle \Psi(p,\sigma) \, , \, (\partial_{|p|} H(p,\sigma))^2 \Psi(p,\sigma)\big\rangle}{\big\langle \Psi(p,\sigma) \, , \, \Psi(p,\sigma)\big\rangle} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\le \left(\frac{2\big\langle \Psi(p,\sigma) \, , \, H(p,\sigma)\Psi(p,\sigma)\big\rangle}{\big\langle \Psi(p,\sigma) \, , \, \Psi(p,\sigma)\big\rangle} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \Big(2E(p,\sigma) \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \, , \end{aligned} \tag{13.16}$$

by the Schwarz inequality and positivity of H_f. However,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \;\le\; E(p,\sigma) &\le \Big\langle \Omega \, , \, H(p,\sigma)\Omega \Big\rangle \\ &= \frac{|p|^2}{2} + \frac{g^2}{2} \big\langle \Omega, A_{\kappa_\sigma}^2 \Omega \big\rangle \, . \end{aligned} \tag{13.17}$$

Thus,

$$|\partial_{|p|} E(p,\sigma)| \le \big(|p|^2 + g^2 \big\langle \Omega, A_{\kappa_\sigma}^2 \Omega \big\rangle \big)^{\frac{1}{2}} = |p| + O(g^2) \tag{13.18}$$

is bounded for any $0 \le |p| < \frac{1}{3}$, and uniformly in $\sigma > 0$. By rotation symmetry,

$$\lim_{p \to 0} \partial_{|p|} E(p,\sigma) = 0 \, . \tag{13.19}$$

Therefore, (13.5) follows from (13.6).

To prove (13.6), we recall the following definitions from the proof of Theorem 12.1:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{(-1)} &= H(p,\sigma) - E(p,\sigma) \\ &= e_{(-1,\infty)} + T_{(-1)} + W_{(-1)} \\ \bar{R}_{(-1)} &= \Big[H_f - \bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\big(H_{(-1)} - H_f\big)\bar{\chi}_1[H_f] \Big]^{-1} \text{ on } \mathrm{Ran}(\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]) \\ Q_{(-1)} &= \chi_1[H_f] - \bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\bar{R}_{(-1)}\chi_1[H_f](H_{(0)} - H_f)\chi_1[H_f] \, , \end{aligned} \tag{13.20}$$

see (12.13) ∼ (12.16), and

$$\begin{aligned} H_{(0)} &= F_{\chi_1[H_f]}(H_{(-1)}, H_f) \; = \; H[\underline{w}[e_{(0,\infty)}]] \\ H_{(n)} &= (R_\rho^H)^n[H_{(0)}] \\ &= H[\underline{w}[e_{(n,\infty)}]] \\ &= e_{(n,\infty)}\chi_1^2[H_f] + T_{(n)} + \chi_1[H_f]W_{(n)}\chi_1[H_f] \\ \bar{R}_{(n)} &= \Big[H_f + \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\big(H_{(n)} - H_f\big)\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f] \Big]^{-1} \text{ on } \mathrm{Ran}(\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]) \\ Q_{(n)} &= Q_{\chi_\rho[H_f]}(H_{(n)}, H_f) \\ &= \chi_\rho[H_f] - \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\bar{R}_{(n)}\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f](H_{(n)} - H_f)\chi_\rho[H_f] \, , \end{aligned} \tag{13.21}$$

see (12.22), (12.18), (12.19), (12.20), (12.21).

To bound (13.11), we recall from (12.13) that

$$E(p,\sigma) = \frac{p^2}{2} + \frac{g^2}{2}\big\langle \Omega, A_{\kappa_\sigma}^2 \Omega \big\rangle + e_{(-1,\infty)} \tag{13.22}$$

where $e_{(-1,\infty)}$ is obtained from

$$e_{(-1,\infty)} = \lim_{n\to\infty} J_{(-1)}^{-1} \circ \cdots \circ J_{(n)}^{-1}[0] \, , \tag{13.23}$$

see (12.5), (12.7) and (12.13). More generally,

$$e_{(j,\infty)} = J_{(j-1)} \circ \cdots \circ J_{(-1)}[e_{(-1,\infty)}] \, , \tag{13.24}$$

for $j \geq 0$, cf. (12.7) and the subsequent discussion.

We recall from (12.56) and (12.50) that the ground state eigenvector is obtained from

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(p,\sigma) &= \Psi_{(-1,\infty)} \\ &= Q_{(-1)}Q_{(0)}\Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(1)} \cdots \Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(n)} \Gamma_\rho^* \Psi_{(n+1,\infty)} \, . \end{aligned} \tag{13.25}$$

We observe that due to

$$\big\langle \Omega, Q_{(0)}\Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(1)} \cdots \Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(n)} \Omega \big\rangle = \big\langle \Omega, \Omega \big\rangle = 1 \tag{13.26}$$

for all $n \geq 0$, where Ω is the Fock vacuum, $\Psi(p,\sigma)$ is normalized by

$$\begin{aligned} \big\langle \Omega, \Psi(p,\sigma) \big\rangle &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \big\langle \Omega, Q_{(0)}\Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(1)} \cdots \Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(n)} \Omega \big\rangle \\ &= 1 \, . \end{aligned} \tag{13.27}$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$\big\langle \Psi(p,\sigma), \Psi(p,\sigma) \big\rangle \geq 1 \tag{13.28}$$

as a trivial lower bound for the denominator in (13.11).

Furthermore, it follows from Feshbach isospectrality, Theorem 4.2, that

$$H_{(-1)} = H(p,\sigma) - E(p,\sigma) \geq 0 \tag{13.29}$$

implies

$$H_{(0)} = F_{\chi_1[H_f]}(H_{(-1)}, H_f) \geq 0 \, , \tag{13.30}$$

and by iteration,

$$H_{(n)} = (R_\rho^H)^n [H_{(0)}] \geq 0 \quad , \quad n \geq 0 \, . \tag{13.31}$$

For the definition of the renormalization map R_ρ^H acting on operators on $\mathcal{H}_{red}$, see (6.5).

An important ingredient in our argument is that by (4.11),

$$\begin{aligned} Q^\sharp_{(-1)} H_{(-1)} Q_{(-1)} &\leq F_{\chi_1[H_f]}(H_{(-1)}, H_f) \\ &= H_{(0)} \, , \end{aligned} \tag{13.32}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} Q^\sharp_{(n)} H_{(n)} Q_{(n)} &\leq F_{\chi_\rho[H_f]}(H_{(n)}, H_f) \\ &= \rho \Gamma_\rho^* H_{(n+1)} \Gamma_\rho \quad , \quad n \geq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{13.33}$$

as the last term in (4.11) is always non-positive for $\tau = H_f$.

The numerator in (13.11) can be estimated recursively using (13.25). Due to (13.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_{(-1)} &:= \| H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)} \partial_{|p|} \Psi_{(-1,\infty)} \| \\ &\leq \| H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)} (\partial_{|p|} Q_{(-1)}) \Psi_{(0,\infty)} \| + \| H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)} Q_{(-1)} \partial_{|p|} \Psi_{(0,\infty)} \| \, . \end{aligned}$$

The first term after the inequality sign is bounded by

$$\| H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)} (\partial_{|p|} Q_{(-1)}) \Psi_{(0,\infty)} \| \leq a_{(-1)} \| \Psi_{(1,\infty)} \| \, , \tag{13.34}$$

with

$$a_{(-1)} := \| H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)} (\partial_{|p|} Q_{(-1)}) Q_{(0)} \|_{op} \, . \tag{13.35}$$

Next, we use (13.32) and get

$$\| H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)} Q_{(-1)} \partial_{|p|} \Psi_{(0,\infty)} \| \leq \| H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(0)} \partial_{|p|} \Psi_{(0,\infty)} \| \, . \tag{13.36}$$

We extend this argument to $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ by induction.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we use

$$H_{(n)} \geq 0 \tag{13.37}$$

from (13.31), and find

$$\begin{aligned} A_{(n)} &:= \| H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(n)} \partial_{|p|} \Psi_{(n,\infty)} \| \\ &\leq a_{(n)} \| \Psi_{(n+2,\infty)} \| + \| H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(n)} Q_{(n)} \Gamma_\rho^* \partial_{|p|} \Psi_{(n+1,\infty)} \| \, , \end{aligned} \tag{13.38}$$

where

$$a_{(n)} := \| H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(n)} (\partial_{|p|} Q_{(n)}) \Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(n+1)} \|_{op} \, . \tag{13.39}$$

From (13.33) and (13.31) follows that

$$A_{(n)} \leq a_{(n)} \| \Psi_{(n+2,\infty)} \| + \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} A_{(n+1)} \, . \tag{13.40}$$

We therefore find

$$A_{(-1)} \quad \leq \quad a_{(-1)} \| \Psi_{(1,\infty)} \| + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \rho^{\frac{n}{2}} a_{(n)} \| \Psi_{(n+2,\infty)} \| \, . \tag{13.41}$$

Our main task is to bound the real numbers $a_{(n)}$ for $n \geq -1$.

The necessary estimates are summarized in the following lemma, whose proof we postpone until Section 13.2.

Lemma 13.2. *We assume that* $0 < |p| < \frac{1}{3}$. *For* $n = -1$ *and* $a = 0, 1$, *the bounds*

$$\begin{aligned} \| \bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] (\partial^a_{|p|} H_{(-1)}) \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] \bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)} \|_{op} \quad &\leq \quad c \\ \| \bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] (\partial_{|p|} W_{(-1)}) \chi_1[H_f] \|_{op} \quad &\leq \quad cg \\ \| \bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] W_{(-1)} \chi_1[H_f] \|_{op} \quad &\leq \quad cg \end{aligned} \tag{13.42}$$

hold for explicitly computable constants which are independent of the coupling constant g *and of the infrared regularization* σ.

For $n \geq 0$, *the bounds*

$$\begin{aligned} \| \bar{R}_{(n)} \|_{op} \, , \, \| Q_{(n)} \|_{op} \quad &\leq \quad \frac{c}{\rho} \\ \| T_{(n)} \|_{op} \, , \, \| \partial_{|p|} T_{(n)} \|_{op} \quad &\leq \quad c \\ | e_{(n,\infty)} | \, , \, \| W_{(n)} \|_{op} \, , \, \| \partial_{|p|} W_{(n)} \|_{op} \quad &\leq \quad c \, \epsilon_n \end{aligned} \tag{13.43}$$

hold where the constants are independent of n *and* σ.

Moreover, the bounds

$$\begin{aligned} \| \partial_{H_f} Q_{(n)} \Omega \| \quad &< \quad c \, \frac{\epsilon_n}{\rho^3} \\ \| \partial^a_{P_f} Q_{(n)} \Omega \| \quad &< \quad c \, \frac{\epsilon_n}{\rho^{1+a}} \\ \| \partial_{|p|} Q_{(n)} \Omega \| \quad &< \quad c \, \frac{\epsilon_n}{\rho^2} \end{aligned} \tag{13.44}$$

are satisfied for $a = 0, 1, 2$ *(these are used in Section 15).*

13.1.1. *Bounds on* $a_{(-1)}$. Let us first estimate $a_{(-1)}$. We recall

$$Q_{(-1)} = \chi_1[H_f] - \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] \bar{R}_{(-1)} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] \Big(T'_{(-1)} + e_{(-1,\infty)} + W_{(-1)} \Big) \chi_1[H_f]$$

($W_{(-1)}$ denotes the interaction operator in $H(p, \sigma)$, and $T'_{(-1)} = T_{(-1)} - H_f$, where $T_{(-1)}$ is the non-interacting Hamiltonian, of vacuum expectation value 0), and

$$\bar{R}_{(-1)} = \Big[H_f + \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] \Big(H_{(-1)} - H_f \Big) \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] \Big]^{-1} \tag{13.45}$$

on $\mathrm{Ran}(\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]) \subset \mathcal{F}$, with $H_{(-1)} = H(p, \sigma) - E(p, \sigma)$.

From (4.13),

$$\begin{aligned} H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}(\partial_{|p|}Q_{(-1)})Q_{(0)} &= -H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\bar{R}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f](\partial_{|p|}H_{(-1)})Q_{(-1)}Q_{(0)} \\ &= -(I)-(II) \end{aligned} \tag{13.46}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (I) &:= H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\bar{R}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f](\partial_{|p|}H_{(-1)})\chi_1[H_f]Q_{(0)}\ , \\ (II) &:= H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\bar{R}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f](\partial_{|p|}H_{(-1)})(Q_{(-1)}-\chi_1[H_f])Q_{(0)}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{13.47}$$

From $(I)=(I_1)+(I_2)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} (I_1) &:= H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\bar{R}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f](\partial_{|p|}(T_{(-1)}+e_{(-1,\infty)}))\chi_1[H_f]Q_{(0)} \\ (I_2) &:= H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\bar{R}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f](\partial_{|p|}W_{(-1)})\chi_1[H_f]Q_{(0)}\ , \end{aligned} \tag{13.48}$$

we find, by expanding the resolvent in $Q_{(0)}$ once,

$$\begin{aligned} (I_1) &= H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\bar{R}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f](\partial_{|p|}(T_{(-1)}+e_{(-1,\infty)}))\chi_1[H_f] \\ &\qquad \times\Big(\chi_\rho[H_f]-\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\bar{R}_{(0)}\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f](T_{(0)}+e_{(0,\infty)})\chi_\rho[H_f]\Big) \\ &+ H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\bar{R}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f](\partial_{|p|}(T_{(-1)}+e_{(-1,\infty)}))\chi_1[H_f] \\ &\qquad \times\Big(\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\bar{R}_{(0)}\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]W_{(0)}(Q_{(0)}-\chi_\rho[H_f]))\chi_\rho[H_f]\Big)\ . \end{aligned} \tag{13.49}$$

The first product of operators on the right hand side of the equality sign equals zero because the cutoff operator $\chi_\rho[H_f]$ on the far right can be commuted to the left, and $\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\chi_\rho[H_f]=0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(I_1)\|_{op} &\leq \|H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\|_{op}\|\bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}(\partial_{|p|}(T_{(-1)}+e_{(-1,\infty)}))\chi_1[H_f]\|_{op} \\ &\qquad \times\|\bar{R}_{(0)}\|_{op}\|W_{(0)}\|_{op}\|Q_{(0)}-\chi_\rho[H_f]\|_{op}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{13.50}$$

Consequently, we find that

$$\|(I_1)\|_{op}\leq c\,\frac{\epsilon_0}{\rho}\ , \tag{13.51}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|(I_2)\|_{op} &\leq \|H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\|_{op}\|\bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}(\partial_{|p|}W_{(-1)})\chi_1[H_f]\|_{op}\|Q_{(0)}\|_{op} \\ &\leq c\,\frac{g}{\rho}\ , \end{aligned} \tag{13.52}$$

for some constants c which are independent of g,σ.

Likewise, $(II)=(II_1)+(II_2)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} (II_1) &:= H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\bar{R}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f](\partial_{|p|}H_{(-1)})\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\bar{R}_{(-1)} \\ &\qquad\qquad \times\bar{\chi}_1[H_f](T_{(-1)}+e_{(-1,\infty)})\chi_1[H_f]Q_{(0)} \\ (II_2) &:= H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\bar{R}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f](\partial_{|p|}H_{(-1)})\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\bar{R}_{(-1)} \\ &\qquad\qquad \times\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]W_{(-1)}\chi_1[H_f]Q_{(0)}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{13.53}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\|(II_1)\|_{op} &\leq \|H_{(-1)}^{\frac{1}{2}}\bar{R}_{(-1)}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op}\|\bar{R}_{(-1)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial_{|p|}H_{(-1)})\bar{R}_{(-1)}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op}\\ &\qquad\qquad \times \|\bar{R}_{(-1)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(T_{(-1)}+e_{(-1,\infty)})\chi_1[H_f]Q_{(0)}\|_{op}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Expanding the resolvent in $Q_{(0)}$ once, similarly as in (13.49), one can see that the term on the last line is bounded by $\frac{c\epsilon_0}{\rho}$. Hence,

$$\|(II_1)\|_{op} \leq c\,\frac{\epsilon_0}{\rho}\,. \tag{13.54}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}\|(II_2)\|_{op} &\leq \|H_{(-1)}^{\frac{1}{2}}\bar{R}_{(-1)}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op}\|\bar{R}_{(-1)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial_{|p|}H_{(-1)})\bar{R}_{(-1)}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op}\\ &\qquad \times \|\bar{R}_{(-1)}^{\frac{1}{2}}W_{(-1)}\chi_1[H_f]\|_{op}\|Q_{(0)}\|_{op}\\ &\leq c\,\frac{g}{\rho}\,,\end{aligned}\tag{13.55}$$

for constants c which are independent of g, σ.

It follows that

$$a_{(-1)} \leq c\,\frac{\epsilon_0}{\rho}\,, \tag{13.56}$$

since $g = c\epsilon_0$.

13.1.2. *Bounds on $a_{(n)}$ for $n \geq 0$.* We have

$$a_{(n)} \leq \|H_{(n)}\|_{op}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|(\partial_{|p|}Q_{(n)})\Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(n+1)}\|_{op}\,. \tag{13.57}$$

To bound $a_{(n)}$, we can straightforwardly adapt the steps between (13.46) and (13.55) in our discussion of the case $n = -1$.

To this end, we observe that in all of these expressions, the indices -1 and 0 can be simultaneously replaced by $n \geq 0$ and $n+1$, provided that the operators $\chi_1[H_f]$ and $\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]$ are replaced by $\chi_\rho[H_f]$ and $\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]$. Correspondingly, we arrive at the bounds given in (13.50), (13.52), (13.54), (13.55), but with the indices -1 and 0 replaced by $n \geq 0$ and $n+1$, and with $\chi_1[H_f]$ and $\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]$ replaced by $\chi_\rho[H_f]$ and $\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]$.

Using (13.43) in Lemma 13.2, we thereby obtain

$$\|H_{(n)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial_{|p|}\tilde{Q}_{(n)})\Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(n+1)}\|_{op} \leq c\,\frac{\epsilon_0}{\rho^3}\,, \tag{13.58}$$

and

$$a_{(n)} < c\,\frac{\epsilon_0}{\rho^3}\,, \tag{13.59}$$

where the constants are independent of n.

13.1.3. *Completing the proof.* Collecting the above estimates, we are now in the position to finish the proof of Theorem 13.1. Using $\delta_n \leq \delta_0 + 2\epsilon_0$ and $\epsilon_n \leq \epsilon_0$ by (12.2), and recalling (13.41), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{(0)} &\leq a_{(-1)} \|\Psi_{(1,\infty)}\| + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \rho^{\frac{n}{2}} a_{(n)} \|\Psi_{(n+2,\infty)}\| \\ &\leq c \, \frac{\epsilon_0}{\rho^3} \Big(1 + c' \, \frac{\epsilon_0}{\rho} \exp\Big[\frac{c'' \epsilon_0}{\rho^3} \Big] \Big) \, , \end{aligned} \tag{13.60}$$

using (12.51). We thus find

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_{|p|}^2 E(p,\sigma) - 1| &\leq 2A_{(0)}^2 \leq c \, \frac{\epsilon_0^2}{\rho^6} \Big(1 + c' \, \frac{\epsilon_0}{\rho} \exp\Big[\frac{c'' \epsilon_0}{\rho^3} \Big] \Big)^2 \\ &\leq c_0(\sigma) g^2 \, , \end{aligned} \tag{13.61}$$

where we have bounded the denominator in (13.11) from below by 1 (see (13.28)), and recalled from (9.12) that $\rho = \rho(\sigma) = c_2^{1/\sigma}$ for $p \neq 0$. For $\epsilon_0 = O(g) < \rho^3$ (which is compatible with (9.12)), we have $c_0(\sigma) < C^{1/\sigma}$ with C independent of g and σ. □

13.2. **Proof of Lemma 13.2.** We shall here establish the bounds asserted in Lemma 13.2.

13.2.1. *Bounds for $n = -1$.* To prove the estimates (13.42) for the case $n = -1$, we observe that

$$\bar{\chi}_1[H_f] H_{(-1)} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] \geq H_f + \bar{\chi}_1[H_f](H_{(-1)} - H_f)\bar{\chi}_1[H_f] \, , \tag{13.62}$$

and recall that

$$\bar{R}_{(-1)} = \Big[H_f + \bar{\chi}_1[H_f](H_{(-1)} - H_f)\bar{\chi}_1[H_f] \Big]^{-1} \tag{13.63}$$

on $\mathrm{Ran}(\bar{\chi}_1[H_f])$. Thus,

$$\Big\| H_{(-1)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] \bar{R}_{(-1)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Big\|_{op} < c \tag{13.64}$$

follows immediately.

For the second inequality in (13.42), we note that

$$\partial_{|p|} H_{(-1)} = -\partial_{|p|} E(p,\sigma) + \partial_{|p|} H(p,\sigma) \, , \tag{13.65}$$

and recall

$$H(p,\sigma) = H_f + (\partial_{|p|} H(p,\sigma))^2 = E(p,\sigma) + H_{(-1)} \, , \tag{13.66}$$

where $E(p,\sigma)>0$ and $H_{(-1)}\geq 0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f](\partial_{|p|}H_{(-1)})\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\right\|_{op}\\
\leq\ & |\partial_{|p|}E(p,\sigma)|\,\|\bar{R}_{(-1)}\|+\left\|\bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\sqrt{H(p,\sigma)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\right\|_{op}\\
\leq\ & c+\left\|\bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\sqrt{H(p,\sigma)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\right\|_{op}\\
\leq\ & c+\left\|\bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\sqrt{\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]H_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]}\bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1)}\right\|_{op}\\
\leq\ & c\,,
\end{aligned}\tag{13.67}$$

using (13.62), $0\leq\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\leq 1$, and $\|\bar{R}_{(-1)}\|<c$ (see (11.32)).

Next, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\chi_1[H_f](\partial_{|p|}W_{(-1)})\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1),0}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f](\partial_{|p|}W_{(-1)})\chi_1[H_f]\right\|_{op}\\
\leq\ & \left\|\bar{R}_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f](\partial_{|p|}W_{(-1)})\chi_1[H_f]\right\|_{op}\\
&\qquad\times\sum_{L\geq 0}\left\|\bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1),0}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]W_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1),0}\right\|^{L}_{op}\\
\leq\ & cg\sum_{L\geq 0}(cg)^L\ \leq\ cg
\end{aligned}\tag{13.68}$$

where

$$\bar{R}_{(-1),0}=\Big[H_f+\bar{\chi}_1[H_f](e_{(-1,\infty)}+T_{(-1)}-H_f)\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\Big]^{-1}\tag{13.69}$$

on $\mathrm{Ran}(\bar{\chi}_1[H_f])$. Here, we have used

$$\left\|\bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1),0}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]W_{(-1)}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f]\bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1),0}\right\|_{op}<cg\tag{13.70}$$

which was proved in (11.33), and

$$\left\|\bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(-1),0}\bar{\chi}_1[H_f](\partial_{|p|}W_{(-1)})\chi_1[H_f]\right\|_{op}<cg\tag{13.71}$$

which is obtained in the same way as (11.29) (since $\partial_{|p|}W_{(-1)}=gA_{\kappa_\sigma}$).

The last estimate in (13.42) was already proven in (11.33).

13.2.2. *Bounds for $n\geq 0$.* We recall that

$$H_{(n)}=H[\underline{w}^{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}]]=e_{(n,\infty)}\chi_1^2[H_f]+T_{(n)}+W_{(n)}\tag{13.72}$$

with $\underline{w}^{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}]\in\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon_n,\delta_n,\lambda_n)$. According to the definition of the polydiscs $\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon,\delta,\lambda)$, in (6.13), and recalling (12.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T_{(n)}\|_{op}\ &\leq\ c\\
|e_{(n,\infty)}|\,,\ \|W_{(n)}\|_{op}\ &\leq\ c\epsilon_n
\end{aligned}\tag{13.73}$$

The bounds

$$\|\bar{R}_{(n)}\|_{op}\,,\ \|Q_{(n)}\|_{op}\ \leq\ \frac{c}{\rho}\tag{13.74}$$

were established in the proof of Lemma 12.2.

For the derivatives in $|p|$, we recall that

$$\underline{w}^{(n)}[z] = (E[z], T^{(n)}[z], \underline{w}_1[z]) \in \mathfrak{D}(\epsilon_n, \delta_n, \lambda_n) \tag{13.75}$$

is *analytic* for $z \in D_{\frac{1}{10}}$, where $\epsilon_n \leq 2^{-n}\epsilon_0$, $\delta_n \leq \delta_0 + 2\epsilon_0$, and $\lambda_n = \rho^n/2$ (see (12.1)). Moreover, we observe that by

$$\begin{aligned} H_{(n)} &= H[\underline{w}^{(n)}[z]]\Big|_{z \to e_{(n,\infty)}} \\ &= e_{(n,\infty)}\chi_1^2[H_f] + \big(T[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + \chi_1[H_f]\, W[\underline{w}[z]]\, \chi_1[H_f]\,\big)\Big|_{z \to e_{(n,\infty)}} \, , \end{aligned} \tag{13.76}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{|p|} H_{(n)} &= H[\partial_{|p|}\underline{w}^{(n)}[z]]\Big|_{z \to e_{(n,\infty)}} \\ &+ H[\partial_z \underline{w}^{(n)}[z]]\Big|_{z \to e_{(n,\infty)}} \partial_{|p|} e_{(n,\infty)} \, . \end{aligned} \tag{13.77}$$

Let us first address the operator $T^{(n)}[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}]$ on $\mathcal{H}_{red}$, and estimate $\|\partial_{|p|}T^{(n)}[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}]\|_{op}$.

For the free comparison operator $T_0^{(p,\lambda)}[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}]$ defined in (6.9), it is easy to verify that

$$\|(\partial_{|p|}T_0^{(p,\lambda_n)}[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}])\Big|_{z \to e_{(n,\infty)}}\|_{op} \leq c \, , \tag{13.78}$$

given $0 < |p| < \frac{1}{3}$. Recalling (13.43), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\partial_{|p|}T^{(n)}[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}])\Big|_{z \to e_{(n,\infty)}}\|_{op} &\leq \|(\partial_{|p|}T_0^{(p,\lambda_n)}[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}])\Big|_{z \to e_{(n,\infty)}}\|_{op} \\ &\quad + \|(\partial_{|p|}T^{(n)}[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}] - \partial_{|p|}T_0^{(p,\lambda_n)}[z;\underline{\mathcal{P}}])\Big|_{z \to e_{(n,\infty)}}\|_{op} \\ &\leq c + \|T^{(n)} - T_0^{(p,\lambda_n)}\|_{\sigma} \\ &\leq c + K_{\Theta}\delta_n \, , \end{aligned} \tag{13.79}$$

for a constant c that is independent of n. K_{Θ} is the constant that appears in the definition of the norm $\| \cdot \|_{\mathfrak{T}}$ in (5.18).

Next, we consider

$$W_{(n)} = H[\underline{w}_1^{(n)}[z]]\Big|_{z \to e_{(n,\infty)}} \, , \tag{13.80}$$

where we find

$$\|(\partial_{|p|}H[\underline{w}_1^{(n)}[z]])\Big|_{z \to e_{(n,\infty)}}\|_{op} \;\leq\; \|(\underline{w}^{(n)})_{M+N\geq 1}\|_{\xi,\sigma} \;\leq\; \epsilon_n \, . \tag{13.81}$$

Note that a partial derivative with respect to $|p|$, for z fixed, is contained in the Banach space norm $\| \cdot \|_{\sigma,\xi}$ on the polydisc $\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon_n, \delta_n, \lambda_n)$, see Section 5.

To bound the partial derivatives with respect to the spectral parameter z, we use the fact that $\underline{w}^{(n)}[z]$ depends analytically on $z \in D_{\frac{1}{10}}$. By (12.12), we know that $|e_{(n,\infty)}| < \frac{1}{40}$. Hence, the derivative in z at $e_{(n,\infty)}$ can be represented by the Cauchy integral

$$\partial_z w_{M,N}^{(n)}[z;\underline{X};K^{(M,N)}] = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{|\zeta| = \frac{1}{10}} \frac{d\zeta}{(\zeta - z)^2} w_{M,N}^{(n)}[z;\underline{X};K^{(M,N)}] \, . \tag{13.82}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \Big\| (\partial_z H[\underline{w}_1^{(n)}[z]) \Big|_{z\to e_{(n,\infty)}} \Big\|_{op} &\leq \sup_{|z|<\epsilon_n} \|(\partial_z \underline{w}^{(n)})\|^\sharp_{\xi,\sigma} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi(\frac{1}{20})^2} \sup_{|z|<\frac{1}{10}} \|\underline{w}_1^{(n)}[z]\|^\sharp_{\xi,\sigma} \;\leq\; c\,\epsilon_n \;, \end{aligned} \tag{13.83}$$

where c does not depend of n.

Likewise,

$$\Big\| (\partial_z T^{(n)}[z]) \Big|_{z\to e_{(n,\infty)}} \Big\|_{op} \;<\; c \tag{13.84}$$

follows from the same argument.

To bound $|\partial_{|p|} e_{n,\infty}|$, we recall from (12.10) that

$$e_{(n+1,\infty)} = J_{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}] = \rho^{-1} E_{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}] \;, \tag{13.85}$$

with $|E_{(n)}[z] - z| \leq 2^{-j}\epsilon_0$, and $E_{(n)}[z]$ analytic in $D_{\frac{1}{10}}$. We infer

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{|p|} e_{(n,\infty)} - \rho \partial_{|p|} e_{(n+1,\infty)} &= \partial_{|p|} e_{(n,\infty)} - \partial_{|p|} E_{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}] \\ &= \Big[\partial_{|p|} e_{(n,\infty)} \partial_z (z - E_{(n)}[z]) + \partial_{|p|} E_{(n)}[z] \Big] \Big|_{z\to e_{(n,\infty)}} \;. \end{aligned} \tag{13.86}$$

Representing the derivative in z at $e_{(n,\infty)}$ as a Cauchy integral, the argument used in (13.83) yields

$$b_n := |\partial_z (z - E_{(n)}[z])| \Big|_{z\to e_{(n,\infty)}} < c\, 2^{-n} \epsilon_0 \;, \tag{13.87}$$

for a constant independent of n. Moreover,

$$|\partial_{|p|} E_{(n)}[z]| < c\, 2^{-n} \epsilon_0 \;. \tag{13.88}$$

Thus, we find

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_{|p|} e_{(n,\infty)}| &\leq \frac{1}{1-b_n} \Big[|\partial_{|p|} E_{(n)}[z]| \Big|_{z\to e_{(n,\infty)}} + \rho |\partial_{|p|} e_{(n+1,\infty)}| \Big] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-b_n} \Big[|\partial_{|p|} E_{(n)}[z]| \Big|_{z\to e_{(n,\infty)}} \\ &\qquad\qquad + \frac{\rho}{1-b_{n+1}} \Big(|\partial_{|p|} E_{(n+1)}[z]| \Big|_{z\to e_{(n+1,\infty)}} \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad + \frac{\rho}{1-b_{n+2}} \Big[\cdots\cdots\cdots \Big] \Big) \Big] \\ &\leq \Big[\prod_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1-b_{n+j}} \Big] \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho^j |\partial_{|p|} E_{(n+j)}[z]| \Big|_{z\to e_{(n+j,\infty)}} \\ &\leq c\epsilon_0 \exp\Big(c' \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{-n-j} \epsilon_0 \Big) \leq c\epsilon_0 \;, \end{aligned} \tag{13.89}$$

by iteration of the identity (13.86).

Next, we prove the estimates (13.44). We recall that

$$Q_{(n)} \;=\; \chi_\rho[H_f] - \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f] \bar{R}_{(n)} \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f] (T'_{(n)} + e_{(n,\infty)} + W_{(n)}) \chi_\rho[H_f] \;. \tag{13.90}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_{H_f} Q_{(n)}\Omega &= \partial_{H_f}\Big[\Omega - \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\bar{R}_{(n)}\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f](T'_{(n)} + e_{(n,\infty)} + W_{(n)})\Omega\Big] \\
&= -\partial_{H_f}\Big[\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\bar{R}_{(n)}\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f](e_{(n,\infty)} + W_{(n)})\Big]\Omega \\
&= \bar{R}_{(n)}\Big(\partial_{H_f}\Big[H_f + \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\big(H_{(n)} - H_f\big)\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\Big]\Big) \\
&= -\Big[(\partial_{H_f}\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f])\bar{R}_{(n)}\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f] \\
&\qquad\qquad + \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\bar{R}_{(n)}(\partial_{H_f}\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f])\Big](e_{(n,\infty)} + W_{(n)})\Omega \\
&= \bar{R}_{(n)}\Big(\partial_{H_f}\Big[H_f + \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\big(H_{(n)} - H_f\big)\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\Big]\Big) \\
&\qquad\qquad \times \bar{R}_{(n)}\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f](e_{(n,\infty)} + W_{(n)})\Omega \\
&\quad - \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\bar{R}_{(n)}\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f](\partial_{H_f} W_{(n)})\Omega\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{13.91}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big\|\partial_{H_f} Q_{(n)}\Omega\Big\| &\leq \|\bar{R}_{(n)}\|_{op}^2\Big[1 + \|\partial_{H_f}\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\|_{op}\|H_{(n)} - H_f\|_{op} \\
&\qquad\qquad + \|\partial_{H_f}(H_{(n)} - H_f)\|_{op}\Big]\Big(|e_{(n,\infty)}| + \|W_{(n)}\|_{op}\Big) \\
&\quad + 2\|\partial_{H_f}\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\|_{op}\|\bar{R}_{(n)}\|_{op}\Big(|e_{(n,\infty)}| + \|W_{(n)}\|_{op}\Big) \\
&\quad + \|\bar{R}_{(n)}\|_{op}\|\partial_{H_f} W_{(n)}\|_{op} \\
&< \frac{c}{\rho^3}\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{13.92}$$

using

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\partial_{H_f} H_{(n)}\|_{op} + \|\partial_{H_f} H_{(n)}\|_{op} + \sum_{a=1,2}\|\partial_{P_f}^a H_{(n)}\|_{op} &\leq \|\underline{w}^{(n)}\|_{\sigma,\xi} \ < \ c \\
\|\partial_{H_f}\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]\|_{op} &< \frac{c}{\rho}
\end{aligned} \tag{13.93}$$

and (13.73), (13.74).

Along the same lines, one obtains

$$\Big\|\partial_{P_f}^a Q_{(n)}\Omega\Big\| \ \leq \ \frac{c}{\rho^{1+a}} \tag{13.94}$$

for $a = 1, 2$, using (13.93), and noting that $\partial_{P_f}\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f] = 0$ (thus, there is an inverse factor of ρ less in comparison to the derivative in H_f).

This establishes Lemma 13.2. □

14. UNIFORM BOUNDS FOR VANISHING CONSERVED MOMENTUM

In this section, we study the renormalized electron mass for vanishing conserved momentum $p = 0$. We shall introduce a quantity $m_{ren}^*(0, \sigma)$, and prove bounds on $m_{ren}^*(0, \sigma)$ that are *uniform* in the infrared regularization σ. We identify $m_{ren}^*(0, \sigma)$ with the renormalized mass later, in Theorem 15.1.

14.1. A second definition of the renormalized mass.

From Theorem 6.6 and the discussion in Section 11, we know that there is a small constant $g_0 > 0$ (independent of σ) such that for all values of the electron charge $g < g_0$, there is an element

$$\underline{\tilde{w}}_{(0)} := \underline{w}^{(0)}[e_{(0,\infty)}]\Big|_{p=0} \tag{14.1}$$

inside a polydisc $\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon_0, \delta_0, 2^{-1})$ such that

$$H[\underline{\tilde{w}}_{(0)}] = F_{\chi_1[H_f]}(H(0,\sigma) - E(0,\sigma), H_f) \; . \tag{14.2}$$

This was accomplished in the first Feshbach decimation step. Moreover, for g_0 sufficiently small (independently of σ), the parameters ϵ_0 and δ_0 are sufficiently small that the renormalization map $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ has the codimension 2 contraction property (6.33) on $\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon_0, \delta_0 + 2\epsilon_0, 2^{-1})$. Then,

$$\underline{\tilde{w}}_{(n)} := \mathcal{R}_\rho^n[\underline{\tilde{w}}_{(0)}] = \underline{w}^{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}]\Big|_{p=0} \tag{14.3}$$

is an element of $\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon_n, \delta_n, 2^{-1}\rho^n)$, where we recall from Theorem 6.6 that

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_n &\leq c_4 \rho \, \epsilon_{n-1} \; \leq \; (c_4\rho)^n \epsilon_0 \\ \delta_n &\leq \epsilon_0 + 2\delta_0 \end{aligned} \tag{14.4}$$

for a constant c_4 is independent of ρ, n, and ϵ_0.

Let

$$\tilde{H}_{(n)} := H[\underline{\tilde{w}}_{(n)}] \; = \; H_{(n)}\Big|_{p=0} \; . \tag{14.5}$$

We may then define

$$\frac{1}{m^*_{ren}(0,\sigma)} := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\rho^{-n}\big\langle \, \Omega \, , \, (\partial^2_{P_f^{\|}} \tilde{H}_{(n)})\Omega \big\rangle}{\big\langle \, \Omega \, , \, (\partial_{H_f} \tilde{H}_{(n)})\Omega \big\rangle} \; , \tag{14.6}$$

for an arbitrary choice of $n \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $|n| = 1$, and $P_f^{\|} := P_f \cdot n$.

We prove in Theorem 15.1 below that

$$\frac{1}{m^*_{ren}(0,\sigma)} = \partial_p^2 E(0,\sigma) \tag{14.7}$$

for $\sigma > 0$.

14.2. The main theorem.

We assume the following condition.

Condition 14.1. *We assume that*

$$\lim_{\sigma\to 0} \lim_{p\to 0} \partial^2_{|p|} E(p,\sigma) = \lim_{p\to 0} \lim_{\sigma\to 0} \partial^2_{|p|} E(p,\sigma) \; . \tag{14.8}$$

Condition (14.8) relates the definition of the renormalized mass $m^*_{ren}(0,\sigma)$ to the definition of the renormalized electron mass $m_{ren}(p,\sigma)$ given in (2.2):

$$\lim_{\sigma\to 0} m^*_{ren}(0,\sigma) = \lim_{p\to 0} \lim_{\sigma\to 0} m_{ren}(p,\sigma) \; . \tag{14.9}$$

The proof of condition (14.8) is given in [5]. Condition (14.8) and Theorem 15.1 combined thus imply the following *uniform* bound on the infrared renormalized mass, which is the main result of this section.

Theorem 14.1. *For $p = 0$,*

$$0 < E(0,\sigma) \leq c_1 g^2 \tag{14.10}$$

and

$$(\partial_{|p|}E)(0,\sigma) = 0 \ , \tag{14.11}$$

for a finite constant $c_1 > 0$ that is independent of σ and g. There is a constant $g_0 > 0$ independent of $\sigma \geq 0$ such that, for arbitrary $\sigma \geq 0$ and for any $0 \leq g < g_0$, such that

$$1 < m^*_{ren}(0,\sigma) < 1 + c_2 g^2 \ , \tag{14.12}$$

for a finite constant $c_2 > 0$ that is independent of g and σ.

Moreover,

$$1 < \lim_{p\to 0}\lim_{\sigma\to 0} m_{ren}(p,\sigma) < 1 + c_2 g^2 \tag{14.13}$$

under the assumption that Condition (14.8) holds.

Lemma 14.2. *For $n \geq 0$, we define the difference kernels*

$$\Delta\gamma_{(n)}[\underline{X}] \ := \ \rho\gamma_{(n+1)}[\rho^{-1}\underline{X}] - \gamma_{(n)}[\underline{X}]\tilde{\Upsilon}^{(n)}_\rho[\underline{X}] \ ,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{(n)}[\underline{X}] \ &:= \ w^{(n)}_{0,0}[p; e_{(n,\infty)}[p]; \underline{X}]\Big|_{p=0} \\ \tilde{\Upsilon}^{(n)}_\rho[\underline{X}] \ &:= \ \Upsilon^{(n)}_\rho[p; e_{(n,\infty)}[p]; \underline{X}]\Big|_{p=0} \end{aligned} \tag{14.14}$$

see also Theorem 6.4. The following identity then holds independently of σ.

$$\frac{1}{m^*_{ren}(0,\sigma)} \ = \ \frac{1 + \sum_{n=-1}^{\infty} \rho^{-n_+}(\partial^2_{X^\parallel}\Delta\gamma_{(n)})[\underline{0}]}{1 + \sum_{n=-1}^{\infty}(\partial_{X_0}\Delta\gamma_{(n)})[\underline{0}]} \ , \tag{14.15}$$

where $n_+ = \max\{n, 0\}$. The series in the numerator and denominator both converge absolutely, and uniformly in σ.

Proof. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_{(n)} \ &:= \ T_{(n)}\Big|_{p=0} \\ \tilde{W}_{(n)} \ &:= \ W_{(n)}\Big|_{p=0} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{14.16}$$

Since $\langle\Omega, \tilde{W}_{(k)}\Omega\rangle = 0$, we find

$$(\ 14.6) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\rho^{-k}\big\langle\Omega\,,\,(\partial^2_{P_f^\parallel}\tilde{T}_{(k)})\Omega\big\rangle}{\big\langle\,\Omega\,,\,(\partial_{H_f}\tilde{T}_{(k)})\Omega\big\rangle} \ .$$

Recalling that

$$\tilde{T}_{(n)}[\underline{X}] = \gamma_{(n)}[\underline{X}] - \gamma_{(n)}[\underline{0}] \ , \tag{14.17}$$

we write $\tilde{T}_{(n)}$ in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_{(n)}[\underline{X}] &= \rho^{-n}\tilde{T}_{(-1)}[\rho^n\underline{X}] \\ &+ \sum_{j=-1}^{n-1}\rho^{-(n-j_+)}\Big[\Delta\gamma_{(n)}[\rho^{j_+}\underline{X}] - \Delta\gamma_{(n)}[\underline{0}]\Big] \ , \end{aligned} \tag{14.18}$$

where $j_+ = \max\{0, j\}$.

Here, $\tilde{T}_{(-1)}[\rho^n\underline{\mathcal{P}}]$ denotes the non-interacting part of $H(p,\sigma)$, cf. (11.8), which satisfies

$$\rho^{-n}\partial_{H_f}\tilde{T}_{(-1)}[\rho^n\underline{\mathcal{P}}] = 1 = \rho^{-2n}\partial^2_{P_f^{\parallel}}\tilde{T}_{(-1)}[\rho^n\underline{\mathcal{P}}] \ . \tag{14.19}$$

Recalling Theorem 4.17, we note that $\tilde{\Upsilon}_\rho^{(n)}$ is identical to $\mathbf{1}$ in an open vicinity of $\underline{X} = \underline{0}$, hence all of its derivatives with respect to $\underline{X}$ or p are zero at $\underline{X} = \underline{0}$. Taking derivatives with respect to the spectral variable $\underline{X}$ for the vector-operator $\underline{\mathcal{P}} = (H_f, P_f)$, and evaluating at $\underline{X} = \underline{0}$, we thus find

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{X}}\tilde{T}_{(n)}) &= \rho^{-n}(\partial^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{X}}\tilde{T}_{(-1)})[\underline{0}] \\ &+ \sum_{j=-1}^{n-1}\rho^{(|\underline{a}|-1)(n-j_+)}(\partial^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{X}}\Delta\gamma_{(n)})[\underline{0}] \end{aligned} \tag{14.20}$$

for $0 \le |\underline{a}| \le 2$. The H_f-part of (14.20) gives the numerator of (14.15), and the P_f-part the denominator.

We shall next prove absolute convergence of the series in the numerator and denominator. The estimate

$$\|\partial^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{X}}\Delta\gamma_{(n)}\|_\sigma \le c_3\epsilon_n^2 \tag{14.21}$$

was established as part of the derivation of (10.16), for $0 \le |\underline{a}| \le 2$ with $a_0 = 0$, where the constant c_3 is independent of $\epsilon, \delta, \lambda, \rho$, and σ.

Based on this estimate, we therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j\ge -1}\rho^{-j_+}\big|\partial^2_{P_f^{\parallel}}\Delta\gamma_{(j)}[\underline{0}]\big| \\ &\le \sum_{j=0}^{\infty}c_3\rho^{-j}\epsilon_j^2 \ \le \ c_3\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}(c_4^2\rho)^j\epsilon_0^2 \ < \ 2c_3\epsilon_0^2 \ , \end{aligned} \tag{14.22}$$

for ϵ_0 sufficiently small and $\rho \le (2c_4^2)^{-1} \le \frac{1}{2}$.

Moreover,

$$\sum_{j\ge -1}\big|(\partial_{H_f}\Delta\gamma_{(j)})[\underline{0}]\big| \le \sum_{j=0}^{\infty}c_3\epsilon_j^2 < 2c_3\epsilon_0^2 \ . \tag{14.23}$$

Both (14.22) and (14.23) are uniform with respect to σ. □

14.2.1. *Proof of Theorem 14.1.* (14.10) and (14.11) were already proved in (13.7) and (13.19).

The estimate (14.12) follows from (14.22), (14.23), and (14.15), for a constant c that is independent of ϵ_0 and σ. Finally, under the assumption that Condition (14.8) holds, (14.13) is a consequence of Theorem 15.1 below.

15. IDENTIFICATION OF TWO DEFINITIONS OF THE RENORMALIZED MASS

For $\sigma > 0$ and $g < g_0(\sigma)$, we shall next verify that the inverse of $m^*_{ren}(0,\sigma)$ in Lemma 14.2 agrees with $\partial^2_{|p|}E(p=0,\sigma)$.

Theorem 15.1. *For $\sigma > 0$ and $|p| \geq 0$, there exists $g_0(\sigma) > 0$ so that for all $g < g_0(\sigma)$,*

$$\lim_{p\to 0}\partial^2_{|p|}E(p,\sigma) = \frac{1}{m^*_{ren}(0,\sigma)} \ , \tag{15.1}$$

where g is the electron charge.

We make the following choice of constants.

For $|p| \geq 0$ and $\sigma > 0$, we choose constants $\rho = \rho(\sigma)$, $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\sigma)$, $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(\sigma) > 0$ sufficiently small so that the renormalization map $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ is codimension 2 contractive in the sense of (6.32) for all $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0(\sigma)$ and $0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0(\sigma) + 2\epsilon_0(\sigma)$.

We choose the electron charge g sufficiently small so that in the first decimation step, $\underline{w}^{(0)}$ defined in Section 11.1 belongs to $\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon_0(\sigma), \delta_0(\sigma), \frac{1}{2})$.

Then, as in (13.21), we recursively define

$$\underline{w}^{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}] = \mathcal{R}_\rho[\underline{w}^{(n-1)}[e_{(n-1,\infty)}]] \ \ , \ \ n \geq 1 \ , \tag{15.2}$$

i.e. $\{\underline{w}^{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}]\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is the orbit generated by $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ with initial condition $\underline{w}^{(0)}[e_{(0,\infty)}]$. Here,

$$\begin{aligned} e_{(n,\infty)} &\equiv e_{(n,\infty)}[p] \\ \underline{w}^{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}] &\equiv \underline{w}^{(n)}[p; e_{(n,\infty)}[p]] \ . \end{aligned} \tag{15.3}$$

The dependence on p is not explicitly accounted for in the notation; we are only interested in small $|p|$, and will eventually let $|p| \to 0$.

By Theorem 6.6, $\underline{w}^{(n)}$ is an element of the polydisc $\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon_n, \delta_n, \lambda_n)$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, where we recall that

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_n &\leq 2^{-n}\epsilon_0(\sigma) \\ \delta_n &\leq \delta_0(\sigma) + 2\epsilon_0(\sigma) \\ \lambda_n &= \frac{1}{2}\rho^n \ . \end{aligned} \tag{15.4}$$

Correspondingly, $H[\underline{w}^{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}]$ is a bounded, selfadjoint (since $e_{(n,\infty)}$ is real) operator on $\mathcal{H}_{red}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

To prove Theorem 15.1, we shall need the following identity.

Lemma 15.2. *Let, for $n > m \geq 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{(m,n)} &:= Q_{(m)}\Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(m+1)}\Gamma_\rho^* \cdots Q_{(n-1)}\Gamma_\rho^* \, , \\ Q^\sharp_{(m,n)} &:= \Gamma_\rho Q^\sharp_{(n-1)}\Gamma_\rho \cdots Q^\sharp_{(m+1)}\Gamma_\rho Q^\sharp_{(m)} \end{aligned} \tag{15.5}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{(-1,n)} &:= Q_{(-1)}Q_{(0,n)} \, , \\ Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)} &:= Q^\sharp_{(0,n)}Q^\sharp_{(-1)} \, , \end{aligned} \tag{15.6}$$

where for $k \geq 0$,

$$Q^{(\sharp)}_{(k)} = Q^{(\sharp)}_{\chi_\rho[H_f]}(H_{(k)}, H_f) \, , \tag{15.7}$$

and

$$Q^{(\sharp)}_{(-1)} = Q^{(\sharp)}_{\chi_1[H_f]}(H_{(-1)}, H_f) \tag{15.8}$$

(see (12.32)). Then, the identities

$$\begin{aligned} H_{(-1)}Q_{(-1,n)} &= \rho^n(\Gamma_\rho^*)^n\chi_1[H_f]H_{(n)} \, , \\ Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)}H_{(-1)} &= \rho^n H_{(n)}\chi_1[H_f](\Gamma_\rho)^n \end{aligned} \tag{15.9}$$

and the "collapsing identity"

$$Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)}H_{(-1)}Q_{(-1,n)} = \rho^n\Big[H_{(n)} - H_{(n)}\bar\chi_1[H_f]H_f^{-1}\bar\chi_1[H_f]H_{(n)}\Big] \tag{15.10}$$

(which directly relates the fiber Hamiltonian $H_{(-1)}$ to the effective Hamiltonian $H_{(n)}$ of scale n) are satisfied for $n \geq 0$.

Proof. The identity (15.9) follows from recursively applying the intertwining identities (12.26) and (12.27).

To prove (15.10), we first verify that whenever $m - n \geq 1$ and $m \geq 0$,

$$Q^\sharp_{(m,n)}H_{(m)}Q_{(m,n)} = \rho\, Q^\sharp_{(m+1,n)}H_{(m+1)}Q_{(m+1,n)} \, . \tag{15.11}$$

This follows from

$$\begin{aligned} Q^\sharp_{(m,n)}H_{(m)}Q_{(m,n)} &= Q^\sharp_{(m+1,n)}\Gamma_\rho Q^\sharp_{(m)}H_{(m)}Q_{(m)}\Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(m+1,n)} \\ &= \rho\, Q^\sharp_{(m+1,n)}H_{(m+1)}Q_{(m+1,n)} \\ &\quad -\rho\, Q^\sharp_{(m+1,n)}H_{(m+1)}\bar\chi_1[H_f]H_f^{-1}\bar\chi_1[H_f]H_{(m+1)}Q_{(m+1,n)} \, , \end{aligned} \tag{15.12}$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} &\Gamma_\rho Q^\sharp_{(m)}H_{(m)}Q_{(m)}\Gamma_\rho^* \\ =\; &\Gamma_\rho\Big[F_{\chi_\rho[H_f]}(H_{(m)}, H_f) \\ &-F_{\chi_\rho[H_f]}(H_{(m)}, H_f)\bar\chi_\rho[H_f]H_f^{-1}\bar\chi_\rho[H_f]F_{\chi_\rho[H_f]}(H_{(m)}, H_f)\Big]\Gamma_\rho^* \end{aligned}$$

$$= \rho\Big[H_{(m+1)} - H_{(m+1)}\bar\chi_1[H_f]H_f^{-1}\bar\chi_1[H_f]H_{(m+1)}\Big] \, , \tag{15.13}$$

using (4.11). Next, we observe that the last term in (15.12) yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\rho\, Q^\sharp_{(m+1,n)} H_{(m+1)} \bar\chi_1[H_f] H_f^{-1} \bar\chi_1[H_f] H_{(m+1)} Q_{(m+1,n)} \\
=\;& \rho\, Q^\sharp_{(m+2,n)} \Gamma_\rho Q^\sharp_{(m+1)} H_{(m+1)} \bar\chi_1[H_f] H_f^{-1} \bar\chi_1[H_f] H_{(m+1)} Q_{(m+1)} \Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(m+1,n)} \\
=\;& \rho^3\, Q^\sharp_{(m+2,n)} H_{(m+2)} \chi_1[H_f] \Gamma_\rho \bar\chi_1[H_f] H_f^{-1} \bar\chi_1[H_f] \Gamma_\rho^* \chi_1[H_f] H_{(m+2)} Q_{(m+2,n)} \\
=\;& \rho^2\, Q^\sharp_{(m+2,n)} H_{(m+2)} \chi_1[H_f] \Gamma_\rho \bar\chi_{\rho^{-1}}[H_f] H_f^{-1} \bar\chi_{\rho^{-1}}[H_f] \chi_1[H_f] H_{(m+2)} Q_{(m+2,n)} \\
=\;& 0\,,
\end{aligned}
\tag{15.14}
$$

since the supports of χ_1 and $\bar\chi_{\rho^{-1}}$ do not intersect. Thus, we conclude by recursion that

$$
\begin{aligned}
Q^\sharp_{(m,n)} H_{(m)} Q_{(m,n)} &= \cdots = \rho^{n-m-1}\, Q^\sharp_{(n-1)} H_{(n-1)} Q_{(n-1)} \\
&= \rho^{n-m} \Big[H_{(n)} - H_{(n)} \bar\chi_1[H_f] H_f^{-1} \bar\chi_1[H_f] H_{(n)} \Big]
\end{aligned}
\tag{15.15}
$$

for $m \geq 0$. For $m = -1$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)} H_{(-1)} Q_{(-1,n)} &= Q^\sharp_{(0,n)} Q^\sharp_{(-1)} H_{(-1)} Q_{(-1)} Q_{(0,n)} \\
&= Q^\sharp_{(0,n)} H_{(0)} Q_{(0,n)} \\
&\quad - Q^\sharp_{(0,n)} H_{(0)} \bar\chi_1[H_f] H_f^{-1} \bar\chi_1[H_f] H_{(0)} Q_{(0,n)}\,,
\end{aligned}
\tag{15.16}
$$

and the expression on the last line vanishes for $n \geq 1$ by the same arguments as in (15.14). We thus obtain (15.10). ☐

Lemma 15.3. *For $n \geq 1$, and $|p| \geq 0$ sufficiently small,*

$$
\Big\langle \Omega\,,\, \partial_{H_f} H_{(n)} \Omega \Big\rangle = \Big\| Q_{(-1,n)} \Omega \Big\|^2 + \mathrm{err}_n\,,
\tag{15.17}
$$

where Ω is the Fock vacuum, and

$$
|\mathrm{err}_n| < c\, \frac{\epsilon_n^2}{\rho^3}
\tag{15.18}
$$

for some finite constant c which is independent of n and ρ.

Proof. By the previous lemma,

$$
\Big\langle \Omega\,,\, \partial_{H_f} H_{(n)} \Omega \Big\rangle = (I) + (II)\,,
\tag{15.19}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
(I) &:= \rho^{-n} \Big\langle \Omega\,,\, \partial_{H_f} \Big[Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)} H_{(-1)} Q_{(-1,n)} \Big] \Omega \Big\rangle \\
(II) &:= \Big\langle \Omega\,,\, \partial_{H_f} \Big[H_{(n)} \bar\chi_1[H_f] H_f^{-1} \bar\chi_1[H_f] H_{(n)} \Big] \Omega \Big\rangle\,.
\end{aligned}
\tag{15.20}
$$

The term (II) can be easily estimated,

$$
\begin{aligned}
(II) &= \Big\langle \Omega\,,\, \partial_{H_f} \Big[W_{(n)} \bar\chi_1[H_f] H_f^{-1} \bar\chi_1[H_f] W_{(n)} \Big] \Omega \Big\rangle \\
&\leq c \|W_{(n)}\|_{op} \|\partial_{H_f} W_{(n)}\|_{op} + c \|W_{(n)}\|_{op}^2 \\
&< c \|w^{(n)}\|_\sigma^2 \\
&< c \epsilon_n^2\,,
\end{aligned}
\tag{15.21}
$$

as it only depends on operators on the scale n.

To study the term (I), we note that

$$\partial_{H_f}\Gamma_\rho = \rho\Gamma_\rho\partial_{H_f} \ \ , \ \ \partial_{H_f}\Gamma_\rho^* = \rho^{-1}\Gamma_\rho^*\partial_{H_f} \ . \tag{15.22}$$

Accordingly,

$$(I) = (I_1) + (I_2) + (I_3) \ , \tag{15.23}$$

where

$$(I_1) \ := \ \sum_{j=-1}^{n-1} \rho^{\min\{0,-j\}} \Big\langle \Omega \, , \, Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)} H_{(-1)} Q_{(-1,j-1)} (\partial_{H_f} Q_{(j)}) \Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(j+1,n)} \Omega \Big\rangle \ , \tag{15.24}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (I_2) \ &:= \ (I_1)^* \\ (I_3) \ &:= \ \Big\langle \Omega \, , \, Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)} (\partial_{H_f} H_{(-1)}) Q_{(-1,n)} \Omega \Big\rangle \ . \end{aligned} \tag{15.25}$$

The factor ρ^{-j} in the j-th term of (I_1) stems from pulling the operator ∂_{H_f} through the n dilatation operators Γ_ρ contained in $Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)}$, which produces a factor ρ^n, and through the j inverse dilatation operators Γ_ρ^* in $Q_{(-1,j-1)}\Gamma_\rho^*$, which generates a factor ρ^{-j}. Together with the overall factor ρ^{-n} contained in (I), we obtain the factor ρ^{-j} for $j \geq 0$. In the case of (I_3), the overall factor ρ^{-n} has been cancelled by a factor ρ^n obtained from pulling the operator ∂_{H_f} through the n dilatation operators Γ_ρ contained in $Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)}$.

Since $\partial_{H_f} H_{(-1)} = 1$, it is clear that (I_3) is the desired main term in (15.17).

It remains to show that (I_i), $i = 1, 2$, contribute only to the error err_n. To this end, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \rho^{-j} Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)} H_{(-1)} Q_{(-1,j-1)} (\partial_{H_f} Q_{(j)}) \Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(j+1,n)} \\ = \ & \rho^{n-j} H_{(n)} \chi_1[H_f] (\Gamma_\rho)^n Q_{(-1,j-1)} (\partial_{H_f} Q_{(j)}) \Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(j+1,n)} \\ = \ & \rho^{n-j} H_{(n)} (\Gamma_\rho)^n \chi_1[\rho^{-n} H_f] Q_{(-1,j-1)} (\partial_{H_f} Q_{(j)}) \Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(j+1,n)} \\ = \ & \rho^{n-j} H_{(n)} (\Gamma_\rho)^{n-j} \chi_1[\rho^{-n+j} H_f] (\partial_{H_f} Q_{(j)}) \Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(j+1,n)} \\ = \ & \left\{ \begin{array}{rl} 0 & \text{if } j < n-1 \\ \rho H_{(n)} \Gamma_\rho \chi_\rho[H_f] \partial_{H_f} Q_{(n-1)} \Gamma_\rho^* & \text{if } j = n-1 \end{array} \right. \ , \end{aligned} \tag{15.26}$$

where the 'collapse' to the scale n is a consequence of

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_1[\rho^{-n} H_f] Q_{(-1,j-1)} \ &= \ \chi_1[\rho^{-n} H_f] Q_{(-1)} Q_{(0)} \Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(1)} \Gamma_\rho^* \cdots Q_{(j-1)} \Gamma_\rho^* \\ &= \ \chi_1[\rho^{-n} H_f] Q_{(0)} \Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(1)} \Gamma_\rho^* \cdots Q_{(j-1)} \Gamma_\rho^* \\ &= \ \Gamma_\rho^* \chi_1[\rho^{-n+1} H_f] Q_{(1)} \Gamma_\rho^* \cdots Q_{(j-1)} \Gamma_\rho^* \\ &= \ \cdots = (\Gamma_\rho^*)^k \chi_1[\rho^{-n+k} H_f] Q_{(k)} \Gamma_\rho^* \cdots Q_{(j-1)} \Gamma_\rho^* \\ &= \ (\Gamma_\rho^*)^j \chi_1[\rho^{-n+j} H_f] \ , \end{aligned} \tag{15.27}$$

since for all $m > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_1[\rho^{-m} H_f] Q_{(k)} &= \chi_1[\rho^{-m} H_f] (\chi_\rho[H_f] \\ &\qquad - \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f] \bar{R}_{(k)} \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f] (H_{(k)} - H_f) \chi_\rho[H_f]) \\ &= \chi_1[\rho^{-m} H_f] \chi_\rho[H_f] \\ &= \chi_1[\rho^{-m} H_f] \, , \end{aligned} \tag{15.28}$$

see also (4.15). Furthermore,

$$\chi_1[\rho^{-n+j} H_f] \partial_{H_f} Q_{(j)} = 0 \tag{15.29}$$

for $j < n-1$, because

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{H_f} Q_{(j)} &= \partial_{H_f} \chi_\rho[H_f] - P_{\mathrm{Ran}(\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f])} \partial_{H_f} \Big[\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f] \bar{R}_{(n)} \\ &\qquad \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f] (H_{(n)} - H_f) \chi_\rho[H_f] \Big] \, , \end{aligned} \tag{15.30}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_1[\rho^{-n+j} H_f] \partial_{H_f} \chi_\rho[H_f] &= 0 \\ \chi_1[\rho^{-n+j} H_f] P_{\mathrm{Ran}(\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f])} &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{15.31}$$

for $j < n-1$. Here, we have used that for $\rho \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $\mathrm{supp}(\partial_x \chi_\rho[x]) \subseteq [\frac{3\rho}{4}, \rho]$ does not intersect $\mathrm{supp}(\chi_1[\rho^{-n+j} x]) \subseteq [0, \rho^2]$ if $j < n-1$ (see the definition of χ_1 in (5.1) and below). Moreover, $P_{\mathrm{Ran}(\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f])}$ denotes the orthogonal projection onto the range of $\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f]$. One finds

$$\begin{aligned} \rho \Big| \Big\langle \Omega \, , \, H_{(n)} \Gamma_\rho \chi_\rho[H_f] \partial_{H_f} Q_{(n-1)} \Omega \Big\rangle \Big| &\leq \rho \Big\| \chi_1[H_f] W_{(n)} \Omega \Big\| \, \Big\| \partial_{H_f} Q_{(n-1)} \Omega \Big\| \\ &< c \rho^{n-j-3} \epsilon_n^2 \end{aligned} \tag{15.32}$$

for a constant c which is independent of ρ, n, and j. Here, we have used (13.44). We get

$$\begin{aligned} | \, (I_1) \, | &< c \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \rho^{n-j-3} \epsilon_n^2 \\ &< c \, \frac{\epsilon_n^2}{\rho^3} \, . \end{aligned} \tag{15.33}$$

Thus,

$$\mathrm{err}_n := (I_1) + (I_2) + (II) \tag{15.34}$$

is bounded by $\frac{c\epsilon_n^2}{\rho^3}$ as claimed. □

Proposition 15.4. *Let $\Psi(0,\sigma)$ denote the ground state of the fiber Hamiltonian $H(0,\sigma)$ for conserved momentum $p = 0$, normalized by*

$$\Big\langle \Omega \, , \, \Psi(0,\sigma) \Big\rangle = 1 \, . \tag{15.35}$$

Then,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \Big\langle \Omega \, , \, (\partial_{H_f} H_{(n)}) \Big|_{p=0} \Omega \Big\rangle = \Big\langle \Psi(0,\sigma), \Psi(0,\sigma) \Big\rangle \, . \tag{15.36}$$

Proof. We recall that the ground state of $H(p,\sigma)$, derived from

$$\Psi(p,\sigma) = \lim_{n\to\infty} Q_{(-1,n)}\Omega \,, \tag{15.37}$$

satsifies the normalization condition

$$\Big\langle \Omega \,,\, \Psi(p,\sigma) \Big\rangle = 1 \,, \tag{15.38}$$

independently of p and $\sigma > 0$, see (13.27). Furthermore, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{err}_n = 0$, since $\epsilon_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Thus, the assertion of this proposition is an immediate corollary of the previous lemma. □

Next, we shall address derivatives in $P_f^{\|} := \langle P_f, n\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}$, where $n \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $|n| = 1$ is an arbitrary unit vector.

Lemma 15.5. *The identity*

$$\Big\langle \phi \,,\, (\partial_{P_f^{\|}} Q^{\sharp}_{(-1,n)})\psi \Big\rangle = \rho^n \Big\langle (\partial_{P_f^{\|}} Q_{(-1,n)})\phi \,,\, \psi \Big\rangle \tag{15.39}$$

holds for $n \geq 0$, and any $\psi \in \mathcal{F}$, $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_{red}$.

Proof. The intertwining relations between the operators $\partial_{P_f^{\|}}$, Γ_ρ and Γ_ρ^* are given by

$$\partial_{P_f^{\|}} \Gamma_\rho^* = \frac{1}{\rho} \Gamma_\rho^* \partial_{P_f^{\|}} \quad , \quad \partial_{P_f^{\|}} \Gamma_\rho = \rho \Gamma_\rho \partial_{P_f^{\|}} \,. \tag{15.40}$$

We thus find

$$\partial_{P_f^{\|}} Q^{\sharp}_{(0,n)} = \sum_{j=n}^{-1} \rho^{\min\{n,n-j\}} Q^{\sharp}_{(j+1,n)} \Gamma_\rho^* (\partial_{P_f^{\|}} Q_{(j)}) Q^{\sharp}_{(-1,j-1)} \,. \tag{15.41}$$

There is a factor ρ^{n-j} in the j-th term of the sum if $0 \leq j \leq n$, because $\partial_{P_f^{\|}}$ is pulled to the right through $n-j$ dilatation operators Γ_ρ until it acts on $Q_{(j)}$. Only for $j = -1$, no additional factor ρ is introduced.

On the other hand,

$$\partial_{P_f^{\|}} Q_{(0,n)} = \sum_{j=-1}^{n} \rho^{\min\{0,-j\}} Q_{(-1,j-1)} (\partial_{P_f^{\|}} Q_{(j)}) \Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(j+1,n)} \,. \tag{15.42}$$

The factor ρ^{-j} in the j-th term of the sum arises because $\partial_{P_f^{\|}}$ is pulled to the right through j dilatation operators Γ_ρ^* to act on $Q_{(j)}$. Only for $j = -1$, there is no additional factor ρ.

Direct comparison of (15.41) and (15.42) establishes (15.39). □

Next, we link derivatives in $|p|$ at $p = 0$ with derivatives in $P_f^{\|}$.

Lemma 15.6. *Let $\Psi(p,\sigma)$ denote the ground state of $H(p,\sigma)$ as defined in (15.37). Then,*

$$(\partial_{|p|}\Psi)(0,\sigma) = - \lim_{n\to\infty} \partial_{P_f^{\|}} Q_{(-1,n)} \Big|_{p=0} \Omega \tag{15.43}$$

Proof. We note that from

$$H_{(-1)}\Psi_{(-1,\infty)} = 0 \tag{15.44}$$

clearly follows that

$$\partial_{|p|}H_{(-1)}\Big|_{p=0}\Psi(0,\sigma) = -H_{(-1)}\Big|_{p=0}(\partial_{|p|}\Psi)(0,\sigma)\ . \tag{15.45}$$

By $O(3)$-symmetry, and differentiability of $E(p,\sigma)$ at $p=0$,

$$(\partial_{|p|}E)(0,\sigma) = 0\ . \tag{15.46}$$

Thus, one immediately verifies that

$$\partial_{|p|}H_{(-1)}\Big|_{p=0} \;=\; -\partial_{P_f^{\|}}H_{(-1)}\Big|_{p=0}\ . \tag{15.47}$$

On the other hand,

$$\partial_{P_f^{\|}}H_{(-1)}\Big|_{p=0}\Psi(0,\sigma) = -H_{(-1)}\Big|_{p=0}(\partial_{P_f^{\|}}Q_{(-1,\infty)}\Big|_{p=0})\Omega\ , \tag{15.48}$$

where we recall that $\Psi(0,\sigma) = Q_{(-1,\infty)}\Big|_{p=0}\Omega$. For brevity, let

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &:= (\partial_{|p|}\Psi)(0,\sigma) \\ \zeta &:= \partial_{P_f^{\|}}Q_{(-1,\infty)}\Big|_{p=0}\Omega\ . \end{aligned} \tag{15.49}$$

Comparing (15.45) and (15.48), we find that

$$H_{(-1)}\Big|_{p=0}(\phi+\zeta) = 0\ . \tag{15.50}$$

Thus,

$$\phi+\zeta = \lambda\Psi(0,\sigma) \tag{15.51}$$

for some $\lambda\in\mathbb{C}$. We shall next show that $\lambda=0$. To this end, we prove that

$$\Big\langle\Omega\,,\,\phi\Big\rangle = 0 = \Big\langle\Omega\,,\,\zeta\Big\rangle\ . \tag{15.52}$$

Since

$$\Big\langle\Omega\,,\,\Psi(0,\sigma)\Big\rangle = 1\ , \tag{15.53}$$

cf. (13.27), this immediately implies $\lambda=0$.

To prove (15.52), we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \Big\langle\Omega\,,\,\phi\Big\rangle &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{j=-1}^{n}\Big\langle\Omega\,,\,Q_{(-1,j-1)}(\partial_{|p|}Q_{(j)})\Gamma_\rho^*Q_{(j+1,n)}\Big|_{p=0}\Omega\Big\rangle \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{j=-1}^{n}\Big\langle\Omega\,,\,(\partial_{|p|}Q_{(j)})\Gamma_\rho^*Q_{(j+1,n)}\Big|_{p=0}\Omega\Big\rangle \\ &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{15.54}$$

(passing to the second line, we have used (4.15)), since

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\Big\langle \Omega \,,\, (\partial_{|p|} Q_{(j)}) \phi' \Big\rangle \\
&= \Big\langle \Omega \,,\, \Big[\partial_{|p|} \Big(\chi_\rho[H_f] - \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f] \bar{R}_{(j)} \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f] (H_{(j)} - H_f) \chi_\rho[H_f] \Big) \Big] \phi' \Big\rangle \\
&= -\Big\langle \Omega \,,\, \Big[\partial_{|p|} \Big(\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f] \bar{R}_{(j)} \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f] (H_{(j)} - H_f) \chi_\rho[H_f] \Big) \Big] \phi' \Big\rangle \\
&= -\Big\langle \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f] \Omega \,,\, \Big[\partial_{|p|} \Big(\bar{R}_{(j)} \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f] (H_{(j)} - H_f) \chi_\rho[H_f] \Big) \Big] \phi' \Big\rangle \\
&= 0 \qquad (15.55)
\end{aligned}
$$

for any vector $\phi' \in \mathrm{Ran}(\chi_\rho[H_f])$.

Similarly,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Big\langle \Omega \,,\, \zeta \Big\rangle &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=-1}^{n} \rho^{-\min\{0,j\}} \Big\langle \Omega \,,\, Q_{(-1,j-1)} (\partial_{P_f^\parallel} Q_{(j)}) \Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(j+1,n)} \Big|_{p=0} \Omega \Big\rangle \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=-1}^{n} \rho^{-\min\{0,j\}} \Big\langle \Omega \,,\, (\partial_{P_f^\parallel} Q_{(j)}) \Gamma_\rho^* Q_{(j+1,n)} \Big|_{p=0} \Omega \Big\rangle \\
&= 0 \,. \qquad (15.56)
\end{aligned}
$$

This concludes the proof. □

Proposition 15.7. *We have*

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n\to\infty} \rho^{-n} \Big\langle \Omega \,,\, \partial^2_{P_f^\parallel} H_{(n)} \Big|_{p=0} \Omega \Big\rangle &= \Big\langle \Psi(0,\sigma) \,,\, \Psi(0,\sigma) \Big\rangle \\
&\quad - 2 \Big\langle (\partial_{|p|} \Psi)(0,\sigma) \,,\, H_{(-1)} \Big|_{p=0} (\partial_{|p|} \Psi)(0,\sigma) \Big\rangle \qquad (15.57)
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. (15.10) yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
\partial^2_{P_f^\parallel} H_{(n)} \Big|_{p=0} &= \rho^{-n} \partial^2_{P_f^\parallel} \Big[Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)} H_{(-1)} Q_{(-1,n)} \Big|_{p=0} \Big] \\
&\quad + \partial^2_{P_f^\parallel} \Big[H_{(n)} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] H_f^{-1} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] H_{(n)} \Big|_{p=0} \Big] \qquad (15.58)
\end{aligned}
$$

We note for the first term after the equality sign that for every operator $\partial_{P_f^\|}$ which is pulled through $Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)}$ from the left, we obtain a factor ρ^n. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial^2_{P_f^\|} H_{(n)}\Big|_{p=0} \;=\; & \rho^n Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)} (\partial^2_{P_f^\|} H_{(-1)}) Q_{(-1,n)}\Big|_{p=0} \\
& \qquad\qquad + 2(\partial_{P_f^\|} Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)}) H_{(-1)} (\partial_{P_f^\|} Q_{(-1,n)})\Big|_{p=0} \\
& + 2\rho^n Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)} (\partial_{P_f^\|} H_{(-1)}) (\partial_{P_f^\|} Q_{(-1,n)})\Big|_{p=0} \\
& \qquad\qquad + 2(\partial_{P_f^\|} Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)}) (\partial_{P_f^\|} H_{(-1)}) Q_{(-1,n)}\Big|_{p=0} \\
& + \rho^{-n} (\partial^2_{P_f^\|} Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)}) H_{(-1)} Q_{(-1,n)}\Big|_{p=0} \\
& \qquad\qquad + \rho^n Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)} H_{(-1)} (\partial^2_{P_f^\|} Q_{(-1,n)})\Big|_{p=0} \\
& + \rho^n \partial^2_{P_f^\|} \Big[H_{(n)} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] H_f^{-1} \bar{\chi}_1[H_f] H_{(n)}\Big|_{p=0} \Big] \,. \qquad (15.59)
\end{aligned}$$

Using

$$\begin{aligned}
(\partial_{P_f^\|} H_{(-1)}) Q_{(-1,n)}\Big|_{p=0} \;=\; & -H_{(-1)} (\partial_{P_f^\|} Q_{(-1,n)})\Big|_{p=0} \\
& + (\Gamma_\rho^*)^n \chi_1[H_f] (\partial_{P_f^\|} H_{(n)})\Big|_{p=0} \qquad (15.60)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)} (\partial_{P_f^\|} H_{(-1)})\Big|_{p=0} \;=\; & -\rho^{-n} (\partial_{P_f^\|} Q_{(-1,n)}) H_{(-1)}\Big|_{p=0} \\
& + (\partial_{P_f^\|} H_{(n)})\Big|_{p=0} \chi_1[H_f] (\Gamma_\rho)^n \,, \qquad (15.61)
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Big\langle \Omega \,,\, (\partial^2_{P_f^\|} H_{(n)})\Big|_{p=0} \Omega \Big\rangle \\
= \;\; & \rho^n \Big\langle \Omega \,,\, Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)} (\partial^2_{P_f^\|} H_{(-1)}) Q_{(-1,n)}\Big|_{p=0} \Omega \Big\rangle \\
- \;\; & 2 \Big\langle \Omega \,,\, (\partial_{P_f^\|} Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)}) H_{(-1)} (\partial_{P_f^\|} Q_{(-1,n)})\Big|_{p=0} \Omega \Big\rangle + \mathrm{e}\tilde{\mathrm{r}}\mathrm{r}_n \\
= \;\; & \rho^n \Big\langle \Omega \,,\, Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)} Q_{(-1,n)}\Big|_{p=0} \Omega \Big\rangle \qquad (15.62) \\
- \;\; & 2\rho^n \Big\langle (\partial_{P_f^\|} Q_{(-1,n)})\Big|_{p=0} \Omega \,,\, H_{(-1)} (\partial_{P_f^\|} Q_{(-1,n)})\Big|_{p=0} \Omega \Big\rangle + \mathrm{e}\tilde{\mathrm{r}}\mathrm{r}_n
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 15.5. The error term is defined by

$$\mathrm{e}\tilde{\mathrm{r}}\mathrm{r}_n = \mathrm{e}\tilde{\mathrm{r}}\mathrm{r}_n^{(1)} + \mathrm{e}\tilde{\mathrm{r}}\mathrm{r}_n^{(2)} + \mathrm{e}\tilde{\mathrm{r}}\mathrm{r}_n^{(3)} \qquad (15.63)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{e}\tilde{\mathrm{r}}\mathrm{r}_n^{(1)} \;:=\; & \rho^n \Big\langle \Omega \,,\, Q^\sharp_{(-1,n)} H_{(-1)} (\partial^2_{P_f^\|} Q_{(-1,n)})\Big|_{p=0} \Omega \Big\rangle + h.c. \\
\mathrm{e}\tilde{\mathrm{r}}\mathrm{r}_n^{(2)} \;:=\; & \rho^n \Big\langle \Omega \,,\, (\partial_{P_f^\|} H_{(n)}) \chi_1[H_f] (\Gamma_\rho)^n (\partial_{P_f^\|} Q_{(-1,n)}) \Omega \Big\rangle + h.c. \\
\mathrm{e}\tilde{\mathrm{r}}\mathrm{r}_n^{(3)} \;:=\; & \rho^n \Big\langle \Omega \,,\, \partial^2_{P_f^\|} \Big[H_{(n)} \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f] H_f^{-1} \bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f] H_{(n)} \Big]\Big|_{p=0} \Omega \Big\rangle \,. \qquad (15.64)
\end{aligned}$$

We find the following estimates.

$$\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{\mathrm{err}}_n^{(1)}| &\leq 2\rho^{2n}\Big|\Big\langle\Omega\,,\,H_{(n)}\chi_1[H_f](\Gamma_\rho)^n(\partial^2_{P_f^\|}Q_{(-1,n)})\Big|_{p=0}\Omega\Big\rangle\Big| \\
&= 2\rho^{n}\Big|\Big\langle\Omega\,,\,H_{(n)}\chi_1[H_f](\Gamma_\rho)^n(\partial^2_{P_f^\|}Q_{(n-1)})\Big|_{p=0}\Omega\Big\rangle\Big| \\
&\leq 2\rho^{n}\Big\|\chi_1[H_f]W_{(n)}\Omega\Big\|\,\Big\|(\partial^2_{P_f^\|}Q_{(n-1)})\Big|_{p=0}\Omega\Big\| \\
&\leq c\,\rho^{n-3}\,\epsilon_n^2\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{15.65}$$

using (13.44). Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{\mathrm{err}}_n^{(2)}| &\leq 2\rho^{n}\Big|\Big\langle\Omega\,,\,(\partial_{P_f^\|}H_{(n)})\chi_1[H_f](\Gamma_\rho)^n(\partial_{P_f^\|}Q_{(-1,n)})\Omega\Big\rangle\Big| \\
&\leq 2\rho^{n}\Big\|\chi_1[H_f](\partial_{P_f^\|}Q^\sharp_{(n-1)})\Omega\Big\|\,\Big\|\chi_1[H_f](\partial_{P_f^\|}W_{(n)})\Omega\Big\| \\
&\leq c\,\rho^{n-2}\,\epsilon_n^2\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{15.66}$$

using (13.44), and

$$\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{\mathrm{err}}_n^{(3)}| &= \rho^{n}\Big\langle\Omega\,,\,\partial^2_{P_f^\|}\Big[W_{(n)}\bar\chi_\rho[H_f]H_f^{-1}\bar\chi_\rho[H_f]W_{(n)}\Big]\Big|_{p=0}\Omega\Big\rangle \\
&< \rho^n\|\bar\chi_\rho[H_f]H_f^{-1}\bar\chi_\rho[H_f]\|_{op}\Big(\sum_{a=0}^{2}\|\partial^a_{P_f^\|}W_{(n)}\Big|_{p=0}\|_{op}\Big)^2 \\
&< c\,\rho^{n-1}\|\underline{w}_1^{(n)}\|_\sigma^2 \\
&< c\,\rho^{n-1}\,\epsilon_n^2\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{15.67}$$

Thus, $\lim_{n\to\infty}\rho^{-n}\tilde{\mathrm{err}}_n = 0$, since $\epsilon_n \to 0$ as $n\to\infty$.

The claim follows from (15.62) and Lemma 15.6. □

Proof of Theorem 15.1: From Propositions 15.4 and 15.7, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{m^*_{ren}(0,\sigma)} &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\rho^{-n}\big\langle\Omega\,,\,(\partial^2_{P_f^\|}H_{(n)}\Big|_{p=0})\Omega\big\rangle}{\big\langle\Omega\,,\,(\partial_{H_f}H_{(n)}\Big|_{p=0})\Omega\big\rangle} \\
&= 1-2\frac{\big\langle(\partial_{|p|}\Psi)(0,\sigma)\,,\,H_{(-1)}\Big|_{p=0}(\partial_{|p|}\Psi)(0,\sigma)\big\rangle}{\big\langle\Psi(0,\sigma)\,,\,\Psi(0,\sigma)\big\rangle}\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{15.68}$$

which agrees with the definition of the renormalized mass

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{m_{ren}(0,\sigma)} &= (\partial^2_{|p|}E)(0,\sigma) \\
&= 1-2\frac{\big\langle(\partial_{|p|}\Psi)(0,\sigma)\,,\,(H(0,\sigma)-E(0,\sigma))(\partial_{|p|}\Psi)(0,\sigma)\big\rangle}{\big\langle\Psi(0,\sigma)\,,\,\Psi(0,\sigma)\big\rangle}
\end{aligned} \tag{15.69}$$

from (13.11). This establishes the equality of the two notions $m_{ren}(0,\sigma)$ and $m^*_{ren}(0,\sigma)$ of the renormalized electron mass.

16. Computation of the renormalized mass

The renormalized mass can be determined to any arbitrary level of precision by use the identity

$$m_{ren}(0,0) \quad = \quad \frac{1+\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \partial_{X_0}\Big|_{\underline{X}\to\underline{0}} \Delta\gamma_{(n)}}{1+\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \rho^{-n}\partial^2_{X^{\|}}\Big|_{\underline{X}\to\underline{0}} \Delta\gamma_{(n)}} \tag{16.1}$$

obtained from formula (14.15).

This follows from the fact that for $n \geq -1$,

$$\Delta\gamma_{(n)}[\underline{X}] = \sum_{L=2}^{\infty} (-1)^{L-1} \sum_{\substack{p_1,q_1,\dots,p_L,q_L: \\ p_\ell+q_\ell\geq 1}} \underline{V^{(L)}_{0,p,0,q}}\Big[\underline{w}^{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}]\,\Big|\,\underline{X}\Big]\Big|_{p=0} , \tag{16.2}$$

where the quantities $\underline{V^{(L)}_{0,p,0,q}}$, defined in (7.3), are explicitly computable. Indeed, the isospectral renormalization group provides a constructive, finite, and convergent algorithm.

We recall here that $n = -1$ accounts for the first decimation step, which is discussed in Section 11.1. Through (16.2), the numerator and denominator in (14.15), and thus the renormalized mass $m^*_{ren}(0,0)$, can be determined up to any given level of precision.

16.1. Determination of the renormalized mass in leading order.

As an application of our analysis, we shall here calculate the term of leading order $O(g^2)$ for the renormalized mass $m_{ren}(0,0)$, and rigorously bound the errors by $o(g^2)$.

Theorem 16.1. *The renormalized mass at conserved momentum $p = 0$, and in the limit $\sigma \to 0$, is given by*

$$m_{ren}(0,0) = 1 + \frac{8\pi}{3} g^2 \tilde{c}_2 + O(g^{\frac{7}{3}}) \; . \tag{16.3}$$

where

$$\tilde{c}_2 := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} dx \, \frac{\kappa^2(x)}{1+\frac{x}{2}} \; , \tag{16.4}$$

and $\kappa(x) := \lim_{\sigma\to 0} \kappa_\sigma(x)$.

Proof. We set $\sigma = 0$, and let

$$\tilde{H}_{(n)} \quad = \quad H[\underline{w}^{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}]\Big|_{p=0}] \; = \; \tilde{e}_{(n,\infty)}\chi_1^2[H_f] + \tilde{T}_{(n)} + \tilde{W}_{(n)} \tag{16.5}$$

denote the effective Hamiltonian on scale n, where here and in the sequel, the tilde shall notationally account for evaluation at $p = 0$.

We have

$$\underline{w}^{(n)} \in \mathfrak{D}^{(\mu=1)}(\epsilon_n, \delta_n, \lambda_n) \tag{16.6}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_n &< (c_4\rho)^n\epsilon_0 \; < \; 2^{-n}\epsilon_0 \\ \delta_n &\leq \delta_0 + 2\epsilon_0 \\ \lambda_n &= \frac{1}{2}\rho^n \end{aligned} \tag{16.7}$$

(c_4 is defined in (10.18)) and

$$|e_{(n,\infty)}| \; < \; 2^{-n}\epsilon_0 \; , \tag{16.8}$$

where

$$\epsilon_0, \delta_0 \; = \; O(g) \; . \tag{16.9}$$

Codimension 2 contractivity of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ on $\mathfrak{D}(\epsilon_0, \delta_0 + 2\epsilon_0, 1/2)$ is ensured by the requirement

$$\rho \; < \; \frac{1}{2c_4^2} \; , \tag{16.10}$$

see Section 10.

16.1.1. *Calculation of the leading term.* We determine the leading order contribution $V^{(L=2;n)}_{\underline{0,1,0,1}}[\underline{X}]$ in (16.2) explicitly for $n = -1$ and $n = 0$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} V^{(L=2;-1)}_{\underline{0,1,0,1}}[\underline{X}] \; = \; -\Big\langle \Omega \, , \, & \tilde{W}^{(-1)}_{0,1}[\underline{\mathcal{P}} + \underline{X}]\bar{\chi}_1[H_f + X_0] \\ & \bar{R}^{(-1)}_0[\underline{\mathcal{P}} + \underline{X}]\bar{\chi}_1[H_f + X_0]\tilde{W}^{(-1)}_{1,0}[\underline{\mathcal{P}} + \underline{X}]\Omega \Big\rangle \; , \end{aligned} \tag{16.11}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} V^{(L=2;0)}_{\underline{0,1,0,1}}[\underline{X}] \; = \; -\frac{1}{\rho}\Big\langle \Omega \, , \, & \tilde{W}^{(0)}_{0,1}[\underline{\mathcal{P}} + \rho\underline{X}]\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f + \rho X_0] \\ & \bar{R}^{(0)}_0[\underline{\mathcal{P}} + \rho\underline{X}]\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f + \rho X_0]\tilde{W}^{(0)}_{1,0}[\underline{\mathcal{P}} + \rho\underline{X}]\Omega \Big\rangle \; . \end{aligned} \tag{16.12}$$

We recall the definition of the operators appearing here.

In the case $n = -1$, we have

$$\tilde{T}_{(-1)} = e_{(-1,\infty)}\mathbf{1} + H_f + \frac{P_f^2}{2} \; , \tag{16.13}$$

so that

$$\bar{R}^{(-1)}_0[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] \; = \; \Big[H_f + \big(e_{(-1,\infty)} + \frac{1}{2}P_f^2 \big)\bar{\chi}_1^2[H_f] \Big]^{-1} \tag{16.14}$$

on the range of $\mathrm{Ran}(\bar{\chi}_1[H_f])$. Furthermore,

$$W^{(-1)}_{1,0} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{dK}{|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}} a^*(K) w^{(-1)}_{1,0}[\underline{\mathcal{P}}; K] = (W^{(-1)}_{0,1})^* \tag{16.15}$$

with

$$w^{(-1)}_{1,0}[\underline{\mathcal{P}}; K] = g\langle \epsilon(K) \, , \, P_f \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}\kappa(|k|) \; , \tag{16.16}$$

where $\kappa(|k|) = \lim_{\sigma\to 0}\kappa_\sigma(|k|)$.

In the case $n = 0$, our analysis of the first Feshbach decimation step in Section 11.1 has yielded

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_{(0)}[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] &= H_f + \frac{1}{2} P_f^2 \chi_1^2[H_f] - \frac{1}{4} P_f^4 \frac{\bar{\chi}_1^2[H_f] \chi_1^2[H_f]}{H_f + \frac{1}{2} P_f^2 \bar{\chi}_1^2[H_f]} \\ &\qquad + \Delta \tilde{T}_{(0)}[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] \,, \end{aligned} \tag{16.17}$$

where $\|\Delta \tilde{T}_{(0)}\|_{\mathfrak{T}} \leq O(g^2)$ contains all terms depending on $e_{(-1,\infty)} = O(g^2)$. We therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{R}_0^{(0)}[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] &= \Big[H_f + \frac{1}{2} P_f^2 \bar{\chi}_\rho^2[H_f] \chi_1^2[H_f] \\ &\qquad - \frac{1}{4} P_f^4 \frac{\bar{\chi}_\rho^2[H_f] \chi_1^2[H_f]}{H_f + \frac{1}{2} P_f^2 \bar{\chi}_1^2[H_f]} \Big]^{-1} + O(g^2) \end{aligned} \tag{16.18}$$

on the range of $\mathrm{Ran}(\bar{\chi}_\rho[H_f])$, where the term of order $O(g^2)$ is small with respect to $\| \cdot \|_{\mathfrak{T}}$. Moreover, we recall that

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_1^{(-1)}[e_{(-1,\infty)}; \underline{\mathcal{P}}] &= \mathbf{1} - \frac{1}{2} P_f^2 \frac{\bar{\chi}_1^2[H_f]}{H_f + \frac{1}{2} P_f^2 \bar{\chi}_1^2[H_f]} \\ &\qquad + \Delta \Upsilon_1^{(-1)}[e_{(-1,\infty)}; \underline{\mathcal{P}}] \,, \end{aligned} \tag{16.19}$$

where the terms depending on $e_{(-1,\infty)} = O(g^2)$ have been absorbed into the error term with $\|\Delta \Upsilon_1^{(-1)}\|_{\mathfrak{T}} \leq O(g^2)$. Then,

$$W_{1,0}^{(0)} = \int_{B_1} \frac{dK}{|k|^{\frac{1}{2}}} a^*(K) w_{1,0}^{(0)}[\underline{\mathcal{P}}; K] = (W_{0,1}^{(0)})^* \tag{16.20}$$

with

$$w_{1,0}^{(0)}[\underline{\mathcal{P}}; K] = \Upsilon_1^{(-1)}[\underline{\mathcal{P}} + \underline{k}] w_{1,0}^{(-1)}[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] \Upsilon_1^{(-1)}[\underline{\mathcal{P}}] + \Delta w_{1,0}^{(0)}[\underline{\mathcal{P}}; K] \,, \tag{16.21}$$

where the analysis in Section 10 has shown that $\|\Delta w_{1,0}^{(0)}\|_\sigma^\sharp \leq O(\epsilon_0^2) = O(g^2)$.

Evaluating (16.11) and (16.12), we choose an arbitrary unit vector $n \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and differentiate with respect to $X^\| = \langle X, n \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}$. The result for $n = -1$ and $n = 0$ is

$$\partial_{X^\|}^2 \Big|_{\underline{X} \to \underline{0}} \underline{V_{0,1,0,1}^{(L=2;n)}} = \frac{8\pi}{3} g^2 C_n + O(g^3) \tag{16.22}$$

with

$$C_{-1} = \int_0^\infty dx \, \frac{\kappa^2(x) \bar{\chi}_1^2[x]}{1 + \frac{x}{2} \bar{\chi}_1^2[x]} \tag{16.23}$$

and

$$C_0 = \int_0^1 dx \frac{\bar{\chi}_\rho^2[x] \chi_1^2[x] (1 - \frac{x}{2} \frac{\bar{\chi}_1^2[x]}{1 + \frac{x}{2} \bar{\chi}_1^2[x]})^2}{1 + \frac{x}{2} \chi_1^2[x] \bar{\chi}_\rho^2[x] - \frac{x^2}{4} \bar{\chi}_1^2[x] \chi_1^2[x] \frac{1}{1 + \frac{x}{2} \bar{\chi}_1^2[x]}} \,. \tag{16.24}$$

A straightforward calculation (using $\chi_1^2 + \bar{\chi}_1^2 = 1$) shows that

$$C_{-1} + C_0 = \int_0^\infty dx \, \frac{\kappa^2(x) \bar{\chi}_\rho^2[x]}{1 + \frac{x}{2} \bar{\chi}_\rho^2[x]} \,, \tag{16.25}$$

which is similar to C_{-1}, but with $\bar{\chi}_1$ replaced by $\bar{\chi}_\rho$. This is a consequence of the composition property of the smooth Feshbach map, see Section 4.4.

Thus clearly,

$$|C_{-1} + C_0 - \tilde{c}_2| < O(\rho g^2) \,, \tag{16.26}$$

where ρ is chosen g-dependent and small in the end.

16.1.2. *Higher order errors.* We shall next estimate the higher order corrections to the leading term.

Lemma 16.2. *For $n = -1$,*

$$\Big\| \Delta\gamma_{(-1)} + V^{(L=2;-1)}_{\underline{0,1,0,1}} \Big\|_{\mathfrak{T}} \; < \; c g^3 \,, \tag{16.27}$$

while for $n \geq 0$,

$$\Big\| \Delta\gamma_{(n)} + V^{(L=2;n)}_{\underline{0,1,0,1}} \Big\|_{\mathfrak{T}} \; < \; c g^3 \frac{(c_4\rho)^{3n}}{\rho^2} \,. \tag{16.28}$$

Proof. This follows from the calculation in (10.14), which gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Big\| \sum_{L=3}^{\infty} (-1)^{L-1} \sum_{\substack{p_1,q_1,\dots,p_L,q_L: \\ p_\ell+q_\ell \geq 1}} V^{(L;n)}_{\underline{0,p,0,q}} \Big[\underline{w}^{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}] \, \Big| \, \underline{X} \Big] \Big|_{p=0} \Big\|_{\mathfrak{T}} \\
\leq \;\; & 20\, C_\Theta^2 \rho \sum_{L=3}^{\infty} (L+1)^2 \Big(\frac{C_\Theta}{\rho} \Big)^L \\
& \quad \times \sum_{\substack{p_1,q_1,\dots,p_L,q_L: \\ p_\ell+q_\ell \geq 1}} \prod_{\ell=1}^{L} \Big\{ \Big(\frac{2}{\sqrt{p_\ell}} \Big)^{p_\ell} \Big(\frac{2}{\sqrt{q_\ell}} \Big)^{q_\ell} \| w^{(n)}_{p_\ell,q_\ell} \|^\sharp_\sigma \Big\} \\
\leq \;\; & 20\, C_\Theta^2 \rho \sum_{L=3}^{\infty} (L+1)^2 (B^{(n)})^L \\
\leq \;\; & \frac{2000 C_\Theta^5}{\rho^2} \| \underline{w}_1^{(n)} \|^3_{\xi,\sigma}
\end{aligned} \tag{16.29}$$

for $n \geq 1$, where we recall that

$$B^{(n)} := \frac{C_\Theta}{\rho(1-2\xi)^2} \| \underline{w}_1 \|_{\xi,\sigma} \leq \frac{4 C_\Theta}{\rho} \| \underline{w}_1^{(n)} \|_{\xi,\sigma} \tag{16.30}$$

for $\xi < \frac{1}{4}$, and use $\sum_{L=3}^{\infty} (L+1)^2 B^L < 25 B^3$ for $B < \frac{1}{10}$. Since

$$\| \underline{w}_1^{(n)} \|_{\xi,\sigma} \leq \epsilon_n \; \leq \; (c_4\rho)^n \epsilon_0 \,, \tag{16.31}$$

we get

$$(\, 16.29) \leq \frac{2000 C_\Theta^5}{\rho^2} (c_4\rho)^{3n} \epsilon_0^3 \,, \tag{16.32}$$

and we recall that $\epsilon_0 = O(g)$.

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{p\geq 2}\Big\| V^{(L=2;n)}_{\underline{0,p,0,p}}\Big\|_{\mathfrak{T}} &\leq 20\,\frac{C_\Theta^3}{\rho}\sum_{p\geq 2}\|w^{(n)}_{0,p}\|^\sharp_\sigma\|w^{(n)}_{p,0}\|^\sharp_\sigma \\ &\leq 20\,\frac{C_\Theta^3}{\rho}\|\underline{w}^{(n)}_2\|^2_{\sigma,\xi} \\ &\leq 20\,\frac{C_\Theta^3}{\rho}\epsilon_n^4\ . \qquad (16.33)\end{aligned}$$

It is clear that in the case $L = 2$, only $V^{(L=2;n)}_{\underline{0,p,0,q}}$ with $p = q$ are non-zero. This proves (16.28).

The bound (16.27) for $n = -1$ is obtained similarly, but uses the modifications described in Section 11.1 (replacement of operator norm bounds on the interaction operators by relative bounds of $\tilde{W}_{(-1)}$ with respect to the free Hamiltonian $\tilde{T}_{(-1)}$). □

Lemma 16.3.

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\rho^{-n}\big|\partial^2_{X^\|}\Delta\gamma_{(n)}\big| \quad\leq\quad c\rho g^2\ , \qquad (16.34)$$

for $\rho < \frac{1}{2c_4^2} \ll 1$.

Proof. In the case $n = 1$, one can explicitly verify that

$$\Big|\partial^2_{X^\|}\Big|_{\underline{X}\to\underline{0}} V^{(L=2;1)}_{\underline{0,1,0,1}}\Big| \leq c\epsilon_1^2 \qquad (16.35)$$

(no inverse factors of ρ). The calculation is essentially the same as for C_0. Combining (16.29) and (16.33) for $n = 1$, we thus obtain

$$\Big\|\partial^2_{X^\|}\Big|_{\underline{X}\to\underline{0}}\Delta\gamma_{(1)}\Big\|_{\mathfrak{T}} \leq O(\epsilon_1^2) + O(\rho^{-2}\epsilon_1^3)\ . \qquad (16.36)$$

For $n \geq 2$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}|\partial^2_{X^\|}\Delta\gamma_{(n)}| &\leq \sum_{L=2}^{\infty}(-1)^{L-1}\sum_{\substack{p_1,q_1,\dots,p_L,q_L:\\ p_\ell+q_\ell\geq 1}}\Big|\partial^2_{X^\|}V^{(L;n)}_{\underline{0,p,0,q}}\Big[\underline{w}^{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}]\,\Big|\,\underline{X}\Big]\Big|_{p=0}\Big| \\ &\leq 20\,C_\Theta^2\rho\sum_{L=2}^{\infty}(L+1)^2(B^{(n)})^L \\ &\leq \frac{960C_\Theta^4}{\rho}\|\underline{w}^{(n)}_1\|^2_{\xi,\sigma} \\ &\leq \frac{960C_\Theta^4}{\rho}\epsilon_n^2\ , \qquad (16.37)\end{aligned}$$

by the same arguments as in the proof of the previous lemma, or in Section 10.

Thus, recalling that $\epsilon_n = (c_4\rho)^n\epsilon_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\rho^{-n}\big|\partial_{X^{\parallel}}^2\Delta\gamma_{(n)}\big| &\leq c\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\rho^{-n}\epsilon_n^2\\ &= c\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(c_4^2\rho)^n\epsilon_0^2\\ &< c\rho\epsilon_0^2 \;=\; O(\rho g^2) \qquad (16.38)\end{aligned}$$

where $\rho < \frac{1}{2c_4^2} \ll 1$. □

16.1.3. *The denominator of (16.1).* Collecting the above results, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\sum_{n\geq -1}\rho^{-n}\partial_{X^{\parallel}}^2\Big|_{\underline{X}\to\underline{0}}\Delta\gamma_{(n)} - \tilde{c}_2\Big| &\leq |C_0 + C_1 - \tilde{c}_2|\\ &+ \sum_{n=-1,0}\Big\|\Delta\gamma_{(n)} + V_{\underline{0,1,0,1}}^{(L=2;n)}\Big\|_{\mathfrak{T}}\\ &+ \sum_{n\geq 1}\rho^{-n}\big|\,\partial_{X^{\parallel}}^2\Big|_{\underline{X}\to\underline{0}}\Delta\gamma_{(n)}\,\big|\\ &\leq O(\rho g^2) + O(\rho^{-2}g^3) \qquad (16.39)\end{aligned}$$

for $\rho \leq \frac{1}{(2c_4)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \ll 1$.

16.1.4. *The numerator of (16.1).* One can straightforwardly verify that

$$\partial_{X_0}\Big|_{\underline{X}\to\underline{0}}V_{\underline{0,1,0,1}}^{(L=2;n)} \leq O(g^3) \qquad (16.40)$$

for $n = -1$ and $n = 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\big|\partial_{X_0}\Big|_{\underline{X}\to\underline{0}}(\Delta\gamma_{(n)} - V_{\underline{0,1,0,1}}^{(L=2;n)})\big| &< \Big\|\Delta\gamma_{(n)} - V_{\underline{0,1,0,1}}^{(L=2;n)}\Big\|_{\mathfrak{T}}\\ &< c\rho^{-2}g^3 \qquad (16.41)\end{aligned}$$

from Lemma 16.2. On the other hand, for $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\big|\partial_{X_0}\Big|_{\underline{X}\to\underline{0}}\Delta\gamma_{(n)}\big| &\leq \Big\|\sum_{L=2}^{\infty}(-1)^{L-1}\sum_{\substack{p_1,q_1,\dots,p_L,q_L:\\ p_\ell+q_\ell\geq 1}}V_{\underline{0,p,0,q}}^{(L;n)}\Big[\underline{w}^{(n)}[e_{(n,\infty)}]\,\Big|\,\underline{X}\Big]\Big|_{p=0}\Big\|_{\mathfrak{T}}\\ &\leq 20\,C_\Theta^2\rho\sum_{L=2}^{\infty}(L+1)^2(B^{(n)})^L\\ &\leq \frac{960C_\Theta^4}{\rho}\|\underline{w}_1^{(n)}\|_{\xi,\sigma}^2\,, \qquad (16.42)\end{aligned}$$

for $\xi < \frac{1}{4}$, and using $\sum_{L=2}^{\infty}(L+1)^2B^L < 12B^2$ for $B < \frac{1}{10}$. In conclusion,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\big|\partial_{X_0}\Big|_{\underline{X}\to\underline{0}}\Delta\gamma_{(n)}\big| &\leq O(\rho^{-2}g^3) + \frac{c}{\rho}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(c_4\rho)^{2n}\epsilon_0^2\\ &= O(\rho^{-2}g^3) + \frac{c}{\rho}(c_4\rho)^2\epsilon_0^2\\ &= O(\rho g^2) + O(\rho^{-2}g^3)\,. \qquad (16.43)\end{aligned}$$

for $\rho \leq \frac{1}{2c_4} \ll 1$.

16.1.5. *Determination of the renormalized mass.* In conclusion,

$$\begin{aligned} m_{ren}(0,0) &= \frac{1+\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \partial_{X_0}\Big|_{\underline{X}\to\underline{0}} \Delta\gamma_{(n)}}{1+\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \rho^{-n}\partial^2_{X^{\parallel}}\Big|_{\underline{X}\to\underline{0}} \Delta\gamma_{(n)}} \\ &= \frac{1+O(\rho g^2)}{1-\frac{8\pi}{3}g^2\tilde{c}_2+O(\rho g^2)+O(\rho^{-2}g^3)} \\ &= 1+\frac{8\pi}{3}g^2\tilde{c}_2+O(g^{\frac{7}{3}})\;, \qquad (16.44) \end{aligned}$$

where the bounds have been optimized by choosing $\rho = g^{\frac{1}{3}}$. Based on the isospectral renormalization group, we have here obtained rigorous error bounds with explicitly computable constants. □

In the same spirit, it is possible, by use of the isospectral renormalization group, to determine the renormalized mass to any given level of precision, with rigorous error bounds and explicitly computable constants.

Acknowledgements. J.F. thanks V.B. for hospitality at the University of Mainz. I.M.S. was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-0400526. T.C. was supported by a Courant Instructorship while being at the Courant Institute, in part by a grant of the NYU Research Challenge Fund, and in part by NSF grant DMS-0407644. T.C. thanks V.B and the Department of Mathematics at the University of Mainz, J.F. and the Institute for Theoretical Physics at ETH Zürich, and I.M.S. and the Departments of Mathematics at the Universities of Toronto and Notre Dame, for their kind hospitality.

References

[1] V. Bach, T. Chen, J. Fröhlich, I.M. Sigal, *Smooth Feshbach map and operator-theoretic renormalization group methods*, J. Funct. Anal., **203** (1), 44-92 (2003).

[2] V. Bach, J. Fröhlich, A. Pizzo, *Infrared-Finite Algorithms in QED: I. The Groundstate of an Atom Interacting with the Quantized Radiation Field*, preprint mp_arc/05-52 (2005).

[3] V. Bach, J. Fröhlich, I.M. Sigal, *Quantum electrodynamics of confined non-relativistic particles*, Adv. Math., **137 (2)**, 299-395, (1998).

[4] V. Bach, J. Fröhlich, I. M. Sigal, *Renormalization group analysis of spectral problems in quantum field theory*, Adv. in Math. **137**, 205-298 (1998).

[5] T. Chen, *Operator-theoretic infrared renormalization and construction of dressed 1-particle states*, ETH Dissertation 14203 (2001), and paper in preparation.

[6] T. Chen, V. Vougalter, S. A. Vugalter, *The increase of binding energy and enhanced binding in non-relativistic QED*, J. Math. Phys. 44, No. 5, 1961-1970 (2003).

[7] C. Hainzl, R. Seiringer, *Mass renormalization and energy level shift in non-relativistic QED*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 6, no. 5, 847–871 (2003).

[8] C. Hainzl, V. Vougalter, S. A. Vugalter, *Enhanced binding in non-relativistic QED*, Comm. Math. Phys. 233, no. 1, 13–26 (2003).

[9] F. Hiroshima, H. Spohn, *Mass renormalization in nonrelativistic quantum electrodynamics*, J. Math. Phys. 46, no. 4 (2005).

[10] F. Hiroshima, H. Spohn, *Enhanced binding through coupling to a quantum field*, Ann. Henri Poincaré 2, no. 6, 1159–1187 (2001).

[11] E. H. Lieb, M. Loss, *Self-energy of electrons in non-perturbative QED*, Confrence Mosh Flato 1999, Vol. I (Dijon), 327–344, Math. Phys. Stud., 21.

[12] E. H. Lieb, M. Loss, *A bound on binding energies and mass renormalization in models of quantum electrodynamics*, J. Statist. Phys. 108 (2002).

[13] A. Pizzo, *One-particle (improper) states in Nelson's massless model*, Ann. Henri Poincaré 4, no. 3, 439–486 (2003).

[14] H. Spohn, *Dynamics of charged particles and their radiation field*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2004).

V. Bach, FB Mathematik, Universität Mainz, D-55099 Mainz, Germany.
E-mail address: `vbach@mathematik.uni-mainz.de`

T. Chen, Department of Mathematics, Princeton University, Fine Hall, Washington Road, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA.
E-mail address: `tc@math.princeton.edu`

J. Fröhlich, Institut für Theoretische Physik, ETH Hönggerberg, CH-8093 Zürich, Switzerland and IHÉS, Bures-sur-Yvette, France.
E-mail address: `juerg@itp.phys.ethz.ch`

I.M. Sigal, Department of Mathematics, University of Toronto, 100 St. George Street, Sidney Smith Hall, Toronto, ON M5S 3G3, CANADA and Department of Mathematics, University of Notre Dame, Hurley Hall, Notre Dame, IN 46556-4618, USA.
E-mail address: `sigal@math.toronto.edu`